

The Grassroots of the 1981 Springbok Tour:  
An examination of the actions and perspectives of everyday  
New Zealanders during the 1981 Springbok Rugby Tour of  
New Zealand

Melissa A. Morrison

In fulfilment of the degree of Master of Arts in History

Department of History, University of Canterbury

Supervisors: Katie Pickles and Lyndon Fraser

2017

## Table of Contents

<b>List of Illustrations .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Acknowledgements.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Abstract.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
Historiography .....	7
Methodology.....	13
<b>Chapter One: From where it all began, 1919 to 1981 .....</b>	<b>26</b>
Where did it all begin? .....	26
The New Zealand Army Team Tours South Africa .....	28
All Blacks versus Springboks 1921 .....	30
1928 All Blacks in South Africa .....	34
1937 Springbok Tour of New Zealand.....	37
1949 – Sir Howard Kippenberger makes his feelings clear .....	39
Success for the All Blacks in 1956 .....	42
1960 – ‘No Māoris, No Tour’ .....	43
1965 and Verwoerd’s Loskop Dam Speech.....	46
The First Fully Representative All Black Team Tours South Africa.....	48
To Build Bridges or Intervene?.....	51
The Cancelled Tour .....	53
The Final Tour Before 1981.....	54
The lead up to 1981 .....	56
The Gleneagles Agreement.....	57
The Invitation .....	60
<b>Chapter Two: Day One – To oppose or support the Tour?.....</b>	<b>66</b>
Protesters and Supporters within the existing historiography .....	67
Age .....	68
Gender .....	71
Ethnicity .....	73
Urban versus rural thinking.....	82
Why New Zealanders opposed the Tour?.....	86
Apartheid .....	86
Secondary concerns for anti-apartheid demonstrators .....	91
Why did New Zealanders support the Tour? .....	96
For the enjoyment of the game .....	96
Rugby and Politics .....	100

'They picked on my sport' .....	102
<b>Chapter Three: Day 28 – The myth of protester violence .....</b>	<b>105</b>
Public Perception, the Media, and the Myth of Protester Violence.....	105
Anti-apartheid organisations and the policy of non-violence .....	108
HART's Protest Tactics .....	112
A change in tactics?.....	122
August 15 – the First Test Match .....	128
<b>Chapter Four: Day 28 – The question of police brutality .....</b>	<b>139</b>
Public Perception and the Myth of Police Brutality.....	140
'I will see and cause Her Majesty's peace to be kept and preserved' .....	148
The Police on Game Day .....	151
The impact of the Tour on police personnel.....	158
<b>Chapter Five: Day 57 – The impact and aftermath of the Tour .....</b>	<b>165</b>
Was New Zealand a divided nation?.....	166
A loss of innocence or a loss of ignorance? .....	176
Regaining a sense of normality .....	186
Apartheid and South Africa.....	196
The value of hindsight.....	198
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>202</b>
<b>Appendix A: Questionnaire .....</b>	<b>208</b>
<b>Appendix B: Topics/Questions used in Oral History Interviews .....</b>	<b>211</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>216</b>
Primary Sources .....	216
Secondary sources .....	224

## List of Illustrations

Figure 1. A ticket for the first test match of the 1981 Springbok Rugby Tour of New Zealand, which was held at Lancaster Park in Christchurch. ....	25
Figure 2. Photograph taken by Kapil Arn which shows that protesters came from a large cross-section of New Zealand society. ....	95
Figure 3. Photograph taken by Allan Cumming of protest marshals forming a barrier between police and demonstrators in Dunedin on 11 August 1981. Brent Burnett-Jones (forefront of photograph) is wearing his motorcycle helmet, gloves, and shoulder pads for protection. ....	128
Figure 4. Cartoon by Eric Heath illustrating the apparently divisive nature of the Tour on New Zealand society. ....	168

## **Acknowledgements**

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisors, Katie Pickles and Lyndon Fraser, for their help and guidance throughout this project.

I would also like to thank my family and partner, whose support has been invaluable throughout this process. I certainly would not have made it here without your love, encouragement and pressure to get it finished. A special thank you to my sister, Rachel, for spending hours upon hours reading countless drafts and correcting my punctuation.

Furthermore, an incredibly huge amount of gratitude is owed to my fellow postgrads and office mates who have helped to keep me sane throughout this time.

Finally, I would like to thank the men and women who participated in this research project. Thank you all very much for your time, cups of coffee, and words of encouragement. Most importantly though thank you for sharing your stories with me. Without you no thesis would have been written.

## Abbreviations

ANC	African National Congress
CABTA	Citizens' All Black Tour Association
CARE	Citizens' Association for Racial Equality
CAT	Coalition Against the Tour
COST	Citizens Opposed to the Springbok Tour
HART	Halt All Racist Tours
IOC	International Olympic Committee
IRB	International Rugby Board
NZRFU	New Zealand Rugby Football Union
RWC	Rugby World Cup
SARB	South African Rugby Board
SCSA	Supreme Council for Sport in Africa
UN	United Nations

## **Abstract**

This thesis uncovers the untold stories of everyday New Zealanders, who participated in, witnessed or have memories of the 1981 Springbok Rugby Tour of New Zealand. It is these stories that are missing from the existing historiography on the Tour which tends to focus on the rugby games, the politics of the time, and the protest movement. This thesis uses an oral history methodology in order to gain an understanding of the individual motivations and experiences of the different people who supported and opposed the Tour in the city of Christchurch. By uncovering these stories this thesis challenges several myths surrounding the Tour which have been established and perpetuated by the historiography and which also exist within the public's perception of the Tour.

This thesis argues that a number of these myths are not necessarily correct. One of these myths places the genesis for the argument over sporting contact with South Africa as the 1960 Tour. This thesis disputes this idea, instead arguing that the origin of the debate was actually 1919 when precedents were set for bringing the colour line into rugby. This thesis also argues that Tour supporters and protesters cannot be stereotyped based solely on their demographics. Instead, this thesis finds that New Zealanders had very specific reasons for either supporting or opposing the Tour which were influenced not by demographics, but by personal values and beliefs.

Furthermore, this thesis disputes the belief held by Tour supporters that the majority of protesters resorted to violence in order to stop the Tour from proceeding. Rather, this thesis finds that only a small proportion of protesters resorted to such tactics. This thesis also discusses the use of force by police and argues that excessive force and police brutality were not common occurrences during the Tour. Additionally, this thesis explores the Tour's impact on the relationships between New Zealanders and questions whether divisions occurred within families because of differences of opinion on the Tour. This thesis also considers whether the Tour was indeed the watershed moment that it has been touted as, by analysing the impact that it had on New Zealand society.

## Introduction

**Interviewer:** What is the first thing that comes to mind when I say 1981 Springbok Rugby Tour?

Wow. It's interesting my body sort of went into a, what was it when a moment ago just when you asked that second part of the question, like feeling embattled and feeling vulnerable at times and seeing this huge divide between what people thought about black people, white people in South Africa, and apartheid. **Protester Christine Beardsley.**<sup>1</sup>

Disruptions, riots, civil disobedience, riot squads, just breaking the law basically which, you know, was really upsetting cause I didn't have an issue with the protesters at all. I couldn't have cared less if they'd have lined the streets going to the ground with their placards. If they'd have sat round the ground with their placards I couldn't have cared, that would've been great. [It] would've showed it on TV and showed that we were not into what was going on [in South Africa], but when they crossed the line with the violence and ripping up people's fence posts and throwing tacks on the rugby fields and then of course that created a backlash from the police which no one liked to see. I think that was a lot to do with the anti-Tour feeling cause it just disrupted everyone's life and put people against the whole thing. **Rugby fanatic Michael Ward.**<sup>2</sup>

Just the highs and lows of the emotions that you went through you know. It took you down to the pits – the confrontations, they're not enjoyable as such, the abuse and things that happened on the front line there it's not a lot of fun, but coming out of all that was the relationships that you built with fellow officers that you're working with, the comradery.

**Former Police Constable Leon Eccersall.**<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Christine Beardsley, [interview with Melissa Morrison], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>2</sup> Michael Ward, [interview with Melissa Morrison], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>3</sup> Leon Eccersall, [interview with Melissa Morrison], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.



On August 15 1981, Christchurch was a city on edge. The first test match of the 1981 Springbok Rugby Tour of New Zealand ('Tour') was to be played at Lancaster Park. Anti-apartheid protesters prepared themselves for an uncertain day, donning protective clothing and making final preparations for the march to the rugby ground. Meanwhile, rugby supporters and spectators readied themselves for an exciting game between the All Blacks and their biggest rugby rival, the Springboks. The All Blacks may have won the Christchurch test match, but the day is best remembered for the violence that took place on the streets surrounding Lancaster Park. The events which took place were part of a larger pattern of violent civil unrest on an unprecedented scale throughout New Zealand towns and cities. The country appeared divided between those who supported the Tour and those who opposed it. Rugby supporters believed that they had the right to play and watch rugby without political interference; those who opposed the Tour did so to stand up to the oppressive apartheid regime in South Africa.

This thesis uses an oral history approach to examine the untold stories of everyday New Zealanders who participated in, witnessed or remembered the Tour in order to challenge several myths that have been established and perpetuated in the secondary literature, and which also exist within the New Zealand public's perception of the Tour. Have these myths shaped how the Tour has been represented? Do these myths provide an accurate representation of protesters, Tour supporters and police? The aim of this thesis is to interrogate these myths by using oral history interviews in order to gain an understanding of the individual motivations and experiences of everyday New Zealanders who either opposed or supported the Tour.

The existing scholarship on the Tour focuses on the lead up to the Tour and the events which occurred during those 56 days while the Springboks were in New Zealand. Emphasis has been placed on the rugby games, the politics of the time, and the protest movement in New Zealand. A significant proportion of the literature has been written by those who were involved in the anti-apartheid movement which provides the perspective of those who opposed the Tour. The views and experiences

of those who supported the Tour, however, have been less extensively covered. Recent scholarship has also missed the opportunity to examine how people who were involved at the time view their actions and behaviour in hindsight. The existing scholarship therefore lacks a reflective perspective on events. Furthermore, an in-depth analysis on the city of Christchurch, which offers both an anti-Tour and pro-Tour perspective on events, has not yet been written.

This thesis fills these gaps within the existing historiography of the Tour by taking a history from below approach, in order to uncover the stories of everyday New Zealanders who were living in Christchurch during the Tour. The voices of these people have not necessarily been omitted from the historical record, but their views have been generalised within the secondary literature depending on their demographics. This thesis therefore extends the scholarship on the Tour by going beyond demographics and looking at the everyday New Zealander's perspective on events. This thesis also examines whether the recollections of oral history participants align to what has previously been written within the secondary literature. The voices of Tour supporters and those who opposed it are used so that both sides of the Tour issue are heard and analysed, thus creating a balanced and objective piece which adds to the existing historiography on the Tour. This thesis also utilises hindsight to gain an understanding of how people feel about their actions and behaviour today.

### Historiography

A significant amount of secondary literature has been written on the 1981 Springbok Tour. This literature covers the lead up to the Tour and the Tour itself. The existing historiography can be divided into five main areas; sports history, political history, the issue of race and sport, general New Zealand histories, and the 1981 Springbok Tour as written by those involved in the anti-apartheid movement.

Ron Palenski's *Rugby: A New Zealand History* provides an overview of the rugby relationship between New Zealand and South Africa within the wider context of rugby in New Zealand.<sup>4</sup> Palenski effectively traces the history of these two rugby rivals throughout the twentieth century and illustrates how the

---

<sup>4</sup> Ron Palenski, *Rugby: A New Zealand history*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015).

issue of the colour line in South Africa affected their sporting contact. Despite Palenski's analysis of rugby tours between the two countries, the 1981 Tour is quickly glossed over with very little detail. Only the two cancelled games in Hamilton and Timaru are specifically mentioned, whilst the anti-apartheid movement receives very little attention. This brevity of discussion surrounding the 1981 Tour feels like a missed opportunity, particularly as Palenski spends so much time establishing the context and background for the controversy of 1981 by describing past tours. Palenski's lack of specific information regarding anti-apartheid organisations, their aims, and protest methods is understandable due to the fact that this is a book on rugby – its focus is on the rugby games and players. An in-depth analysis of rugby between the All Blacks and Springboks has also been written by Spiro Zavos.<sup>5</sup> Zavos provides a detailed description of the many games that have been played between the two teams and how the game has developed as a result of their contact. He does mention, albeit briefly, some of the issues which occurred because of apartheid in South Africa. In particular, he discusses the impact that the exclusion of Māori players from touring teams to South Africa had on Māori participation in sport. Once again, though, the 1981 Tour is glossed over in favour of discussing previous tours and the development of rugby.

*Rugby* and Zavos' *Winters of Revenge* fall within the facet of sports history, delving only briefly into the areas of cultural and social history when discussing the importance of rugby to New Zealanders and the impact of exclusion on Māori players. This focus on sports history means that the stories of New Zealanders and how they were affected during the Tour are missing. This is an area that this thesis will address by looking at the impact that the Tour had on everyday New Zealanders within the wider sporting context. It will not take a rugby-focussed approach and discuss rugby games throughout the various tours in detail, as Palenski and Zavos have successfully discussed the history of contact between New Zealand and South Africa on the rugby field.

---

<sup>5</sup> Spiro Zavos, *Winters of Revenge: The bitter rivalry between the All Blacks and the Springboks*, (Auckland: Viking, 1997).

Malcolm Templeton's *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94* provides a detailed description of the rugby relationship between New Zealand and South Africa within a political setting.<sup>6</sup> Templeton covers the relationship from the early 1920s until the election of the African National Congress (ANC) in April 1994 through a political lens. Rugby is not central to Templeton's analysis, but rather he concentrates on the politics of the wider sporting issue. This focus is a result of Templeton's own work as a foreign service officer who was an advisor to the New Zealand Government during the Tour. His former position as a government employee may, he admits in the preface, have led to some bias with regard to certain policies and ministers. However, after a thorough analysis of the book, no obvious bias was evident. Rather, the strength of the book lies in the fact that Templeton did work for the Government resulting in an in-depth understanding of what was happening in Parliament in 1981, as well as access to official government sources. Templeton was given full access to files within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade which was only granted to him because of his previous connection to the foreign office. Other researchers would struggle to gain such unrestricted access which is why this book is valuable, as it provides information that is not widely available. Despite his thorough analysis of the political landscape during the twentieth century, Templeton, like Palenski, does not give a detailed account of what actually happened in 1981. He covers the lead up to the Tour, as well as the aftermath, including the legal appeals to stop the 1985 tour from going ahead, yet the Tour itself, once again, appears to have been overlooked. Templeton's book is ultimately a political history of the relationship between New Zealand and South Africa in regards to sport. He does not look at the social aspects of what was occurring in New Zealand during the Tour. This thesis condenses the political aspects of the Tour, and its lead up, and instead focusses on the social aspects of the Tour, by sharing the stories of everyday New Zealanders.

---

<sup>6</sup> Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998).

The 1981 Springbok Tour has also been discussed with regard to the broader issue of race and sport within New Zealand and South Africa. Greg Ryan has written extensively on the place of Māori within New Zealand rugby.<sup>7</sup> Ryan discusses the Māori contribution to the development of rugby throughout the twentieth century as well as exclusion from rugby tours to South Africa prior to 1970. Richard Thompson's *Race and Sport*<sup>8</sup> and *Retreat from Apartheid*<sup>9</sup> examine the colour line in South Africa in regards to rugby, cricket, and athletics. Thompson discusses the effect that South Africa's racial policies had on sport and sporting contact with other countries, particularly New Zealand. The strength of both books is Thompson's focus on anti-apartheid organisations in New Zealand. Thompson is one of the few scholars to specifically discuss the roles of these organisations, thus making these books valuable when considering the impact that the movement had on the fight against apartheid. These books were written before the Tour and therefore 1981 is not discussed; however, Thompson analyses the wider context of issues surrounding race and sport, with the viewpoints of the New Zealand Rugby Football Union (NZRFU), the New Zealand Government, and anti-apartheid organisations examined in-depth. John Nauright<sup>10</sup> and Douglas Booth<sup>11</sup> focus on the impact that apartheid had on sport in South Africa during the twentieth century. These books detail the significance of rugby to white South Africans before the Tour and therefore explain why the South African Rugby Board (SARB) was determined to continue contact with other countries. The international sports boycott of South Africa is also discussed, as well as the impact that this had on South Africa's economy. These books mention the 1981 Tour, and what led to it, within the broader context of race and sport. There is not a focus on the Tour; rather it is seen as a part of the wider issue.

---

<sup>7</sup> Greg Ryan, 'The Paradox of Maori Rugby 1870-1914,' *Tackling Rugby Myths: Rugby and New Zealand society 1854-2004*, ed. by Greg Ryan, (Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2005), 89-103, and Greg Ryan, 'Anthropological Football: Maori and the 1937 Springbok Tour of New Zealand,' *Tackling Rugby Myths: Rugby and New Zealand society 1854-2004*, ed. by Greg Ryan, (Dunedin: University of Otago Press, 2005), 105-122.

<sup>8</sup> Richard Thompson, *Race and Sport*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1964).

<sup>9</sup> Richard Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid: New Zealand's sporting contacts with South Africa*, (Wellington: Oxford University Press, 1975).

<sup>10</sup> John Nauright, *Sport, Cultures and Identities in South Africa*, (London: Leicester University Press, 1997).

<sup>11</sup> Douglas Booth, *The Race Game: Sport and politics in South Africa*, (London: Frank Cass, 1998).

Within recent general New Zealand histories, the 1981 Tour has not received a significant amount of attention. Philippa Mein Smith<sup>12</sup> and Michael King<sup>13</sup> briefly mention the Tour, but neither describe any of the specific events which occurred or the impact of the Tour on New Zealand society. Tom Brooking's discussion is more detailed with a generalisation of the types of people who supported and opposed the Tour.<sup>14</sup> It is somewhat surprising that the Tour and its impact on society are not discussed in greater detail within these general New Zealand histories. The Tour has been touted as a watershed moment by those who were involved in this study, thus the public perception exists that it was indeed a turning point in New Zealand's history. Yet the Tour has not been significantly covered within the history books. This may be due to the fact that some scholars do not see it as a turning point or a catalyst for change, rather it may be seen as part of a larger trend of change in New Zealand society.

The most extensive amount of literature about the Tour has been written by those who were involved themselves with the anti-apartheid movement in New Zealand. This literature includes work by Richard Shears and Isobelle Gidley,<sup>15</sup> Geoff Chapple,<sup>16</sup> Trevor Richards,<sup>17</sup> Juliet Morris,<sup>18</sup> Tom Newnham,<sup>19</sup> and Jock Phillips.<sup>20</sup> The majority of this work, apart from that of Richards and Phillips, was written in the immediate aftermath of the Tour, between 1981 and 1984. Due to the short amount of time between the event and publication, these books are emotive with regard to how certain events are described. For instance, Morris describes how the protesters felt running onto the rugby field during the first test match at Lancaster Park; "[i]t is difficult to describe the terror of being huddled in

---

<sup>12</sup> Philippa Mein Smith, *A Concise History of New Zealand*, second edn., (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 241-242.

<sup>13</sup> Michael King, *The Penguin History of New Zealand*, (Auckland: Penguin Books, 2003), 488.

<sup>14</sup> Tom Brooking, *The History of New Zealand*, (Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2004), 148-149.

<sup>15</sup> Richard Shears and Isobelle Gidley, *Storm Out of Africa! The 1981 Springbok Tour of New Zealand*, (Auckland: Macmillan, 1981).

<sup>16</sup> Geoff Chapple, *1981: The Tour*, (Wellington: Reed, 1984).

<sup>17</sup> Trevor Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones: New Zealand, South Africa, rugby and racism*, (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 1999).

<sup>18</sup> Juliet Morris, *With All Our Strength: An account of the anti-Tour movement in Christchurch 1981*, (Christchurch: Black Cat, 1982).

<sup>19</sup> Tom Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire: A response to the 1981 Springbok Tour of New Zealand*, (Auckland: Real Pictures, 1981).

<sup>20</sup> Jock Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' *New Zealand Listener*, July 2005, 12-19.

a small group, facing police. What we hadn't expected was the brutal and vicious reaction ... towards us."<sup>21</sup> The use of emotive language is a result of the Tour and its impact on people who were directly involved, still being so fresh within the New Zealand consciousness when these books were written. People had not yet had time to distance themselves emotionally from what had occurred and therefore wrote about their feelings, rather than the facts of the event. It was therefore necessary to separate the facts from the emotions in order to utilise this literature within this thesis. However, the use of emotive language has allowed comparisons to be made between these authors and this study's participants with regard to their feelings during the Tour. Another issue with these books being written by people who were first and foremost anti-apartheid activists is that issues with regards to protester violence are predominantly ignored. Newnham maintains throughout that violence was not condoned by anti-apartheid organisations.<sup>22</sup> In order to maintain that violence was not used, Newnham omits mentioning violent acts that did occur during the Tour, such as the throwing of glass onto Lancaster Park. This leads the reader to believe that all protests were peaceful, which is not necessarily the case. With a large percentage of secondary literature on the Tour being written by people who were involved themselves there is an imbalance with regard to the voices which are being heard. The voices of the protesters are the most prominent. This thesis will address this issue by using the voices of people who opposed the Tour and who supported it. This thesis will therefore offer a more nuanced account of events.

More recent scholarship by those involved, such as Phillips' 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary article, are more successful at being objective and presenting the facts in a way that is not overly emotive. Phillips' work, however, does not give an in-depth examination of participation by everyday New Zealanders during the Tour, rather he generalises in terms of rural versus urban thinking, black versus white involvement, and male versus female participation.<sup>23</sup> The source for this article was a survey

---

<sup>21</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 79.

<sup>22</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 11.

<sup>23</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 13-19.

conducted by Phillips, which included, people involved with the Citizens Opposed to the Springbok Tour (COST) group in Wellington, as well as people who marched in the last anti-Tour protest in the capital.<sup>24</sup> Phillips' conclusions are, therefore, based only on the information provided by people who opposed the Tour. The primary sources, which inform this thesis, come from Tour supporters as well as those who opposed it. This allows for a more balanced representation of the Tour in its entirety, as opposed to a more one-sided approach.

While there is a significant amount of scholarship examining the lead up to the Tour, the Tour itself, and the anti-apartheid movement; the perspectives of everyday New Zealanders, both in support and opposition, is largely absent.

### Methodology

Throughout this thesis both primary and secondary material has been used to analyse the myths surrounding the Tour. Chapter One primarily uses secondary literature as well as archival material, such as newspapers and official documents, to provide context for the subsequent chapters. Chapters Two, Three, Four, and Five rely almost exclusively on the oral history interviews that I conducted. Written personal testimony, which was collected by the University of Canterbury immediately after the Tour, has also been used in order to support the information provided by interview participants.<sup>25</sup>

I interviewed eleven people over a three-month period in Christchurch for this thesis. My aim from the beginning of this study was to interview 'everyday Kiwis.' It is first of all necessary to define what 'everyday' means with regard to whose voices are being heard within this thesis. 'Everyday' refers to people whose stories have not previously been told or analysed within the existing historiography. For instance, protester Trevor Richards is not considered to be an 'everyday New Zealander' for the purposes of this study because he has been written about in the existing literature. Whereas, a member of the New Zealand public who attended rugby games during the Tour, but has not been

---

<sup>24</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 13.

<sup>25</sup> Springbok Rugby Tour Papers, University of Canterbury, 1981. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).



written about in the secondary literature, is considered to be an everyday New Zealander and thus their perspective on the Tour is important for this study. Participants therefore needed to be people whose stories had not previously been told, but who had something to add to the historical record about the Tour. This aim reflects Alessandro Portelli's argument that, "oral history is more intrinsically itself when it listens to speakers who are not already recognised protagonists in the public sphere."<sup>26</sup>

Oral history interviews have been crucial to this study as they have allowed the voices of those previously missing from the historical record to be heard. According to Alistair Thomson, this is the primary reason for using oral histories. He believes that, "for many historians, recording experiences which have been ignored in history and involving people in exploring and making their own histories, continue to be primary justifications for the use of oral history."<sup>27</sup> Oral histories not only uncover the facts of an event, but also the feelings and emotions of those who were there and experienced it. According to Portelli, this is what makes oral histories unique as they do not just tell us about events, but rather the meaning of these events.<sup>28</sup> As there is little archival material on the Tour which describes people's feelings and reasons behind their behaviour, oral histories were therefore a crucial tool in uncovering these emotions. Trevor Lummis believes that oral history uncovers information which no other source can provide, "oral accounts from those who experienced the specific situation provide an unsurpassed and irreplaceable evidence for actual behaviour."<sup>29</sup> In the interviews that I conducted, it became apparent that the participants were not simply telling me the facts of an event, but rather how they felt in that situation. An interview is one of the few ways in which the feelings and emotions of those involved can be expressed and it was this aspect that became a central focus within this thesis.

---

<sup>26</sup> Alessandro Portelli, *The Battle of Valle Giulia: Oral history and the art of dialogue*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997), 6.

<sup>27</sup> Alistair Thomson, 'Four Paradigm Transformations of Oral History,' *The Oral History Review*, vol. 34, no. 1, 2006, 52-53.

<sup>28</sup> Alessandro Portelli, 'What Makes Oral History Different,' *The Oral History Reader*, second edn., ed. by Robert Perks and Alistair Thompson, (New York: Routledge, 2006), 36.

<sup>29</sup> Trevor Lummis, 'Structure and Validity in Oral Evidence,' *The Oral History Reader*, second edn., ed. by Robert Perks and Alistair Thompson, (New York: Routledge, 2006), 260.

The use of oral history interviews as the primary source for this thesis has presented some methodological challenges. In the early 1970s, critiques of oral history focussed upon the unreliability of memory. The validity and reliability of personal testimony was questioned due to the fact that a person's recollection of an event can change over time.<sup>30</sup> Memory was seen as unreliable because it was susceptible to change as a result of nostalgia, loss of memory, personal prejudice, as well as the "influence of collective and retrospective versions of the past."<sup>31</sup> Whereas archival material, such as newspapers and official documents, are considered unchanging and are not distorted by the passage of time.<sup>32</sup> Yet these documents can also be fallible with regards to their reliability as they are "sometimes incomplete, inaccurate, and deceiving."<sup>33</sup> This is why it is necessary to corroborate information from different sources to ensure that it is reliable and accurate. Oral histories, just like archival material, need to be corroborated with other sources which is why it is necessary to have a substantial sample size and to use other personal testimony if it is available.

My oral histories were supported by other available personal testimony, particularly the Springbok Tour Papers at the University of Canterbury.<sup>34</sup> These papers contain written testimony from people who were living in Christchurch during the Tour and which were collected in its immediate aftermath. People from all different backgrounds, occupations, and ages wrote to the University of Canterbury, thus making this an excellent source for comparison with my oral histories.

The subjective nature of oral histories has also caused criticism of their use as a historical source. This is again due to the fact that personal testimony can change over time.<sup>35</sup> Whereas, documents are unchanging and therefore seen as objective.<sup>36</sup> However, in the late 1970s oral historians turned this

---

<sup>30</sup> Donald A. Ritchie, *Doing Oral History: A practical guide*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 27.

<sup>31</sup> Alistair Thomson, 'Memory and Remembering Oral History,' *The Oxford Handbook of Oral History*, ed. by Donald A. Ritchie, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 79.

<sup>32</sup> Ritchie, *Doing Oral History*, 27.

<sup>33</sup> Ritchie, *Doing Oral History*, 27.

<sup>34</sup> Springbok Rugby Tour Papers.

<sup>35</sup> Thomson, 'Four Paradigm Transformations of Oral History,' 53.

<sup>36</sup> Donald A. Ritchie, 'Introduction: The evolution of oral history,' *The Oxford Handbook of Oral History*, ed. by Donald A. Ritchie, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 12.

traditional critique on its head by arguing that the subjective nature of oral histories was actually one of its greatest strengths.<sup>37</sup> Thomson believes that the subjectivity of oral histories offers clues about the “meaning of historical experience [and] the relationships between past and present, between memory and personal identity.”<sup>38</sup> Oral historians therefore began to use memory not only as the source for research, but also as the subject by using a range of approaches, such as linguistic and narrative, to analyse how and why people recall certain events in particular ways.<sup>39</sup> The fact that oral histories are subjective in nature is a real strength for this thesis. However, I did not use this subjectivity to assess memory and how events are recalled as oral historians such as Thomson have done. Rather, this thesis uses oral histories in order to uncover not only untold stories, but also the emotions of participants during the Tour.

A further benefit of oral history is that it allows the unique memories and stories of everyday people to be told. This means that oral histories can be used to challenge the accepted, traditional history of an event, which have been written about, or by, those at the forefront of the event or issue.<sup>40</sup> The primary aim of this research is to challenge a number of myths which have been perpetuated by the secondary literature and in order to do this the unique memories and stories of participants have needed to be told. Therefore, the participants’ subjectivity about their experiences was a strength for this thesis in achieving its aims. This conforms to Paul Thompson’s belief that oral histories help to counter what traditional history, that which is written based on traditional sources, has said about certain events.<sup>41</sup> Thompson argues that “oral history offers a challenge to the accepted myths of history, to the authoritarian judgement inherent in its tradition.”<sup>42</sup> This facet of oral history has been

---

<sup>37</sup> Thomson, ‘Memory and Remembering Oral History,’ 80.

<sup>38</sup> Thomson, ‘Memory and Remembering Oral History,’ 80.

<sup>39</sup> Thomson, ‘Memory and Remembering Oral History,’ 80.

<sup>40</sup> Paul Thompson, ‘The Voice of the Past: Oral history,’ *The Oral History Reader*, second edn., ed. by Robert Perks and Alistair Thompson, (New York: Routledge, 2006), 31.

<sup>41</sup> Thompson, ‘The Voice of the Past,’ 31.

<sup>42</sup> Thompson, ‘The Voice of the Past,’ 31.

pertinent to this study as my research challenges the myths which have been perpetuated by the secondary literature on the Tour.

When discussing hindsight with participants it was necessary to be wary of possible bias. According to Donald Pennington, hindsight bias refers to the fact that people are more knowledgeable and wise after an event has occurred when they know what the final outcome was.<sup>43</sup> They will therefore be more assertive when discussing their past actions if the final outcome was perceived to be positive.<sup>44</sup> For instance, a demonstrator could potentially be prouder of the fact they were arrested during the Tour if they knew that they would eventually be discharged without conviction. Before having this future knowledge of the outcome though, they could have been scared about what would happen because of their arrest. Protester Debbie Osborn, who was arrested on multiple occasions, admits that she was scared at the time when she was unsure about what would happen to her in court.<sup>45</sup> She did not come across in the interview as smug or arrogant when talking about her arrests despite the fact that the outcomes were positive in that she was discharged without conviction. Debbie therefore did not appear to have been affected by hindsight bias.

For this study finding 'everyday New Zealanders' to interview proved to be a difficult task. If I had chosen to interview more prominent individuals who were involved with the Tour this would have been relatively straightforward. Those who were at the forefront of protests, for instance Marion Hobbs and John Minto, would have been easy to find because they are relatively well known. However, their stories have previously been told within the historiography. Finding people who were not at the forefront of protests or who simply attended each of the rugby games proved to be more difficult. This is due to the fact that there are no publicly accessible records of the everyday people who attended protests or rugby games. There are also no organised communities of these people as they came from a cross-section of New Zealand society and tended to only associate within their own

---

<sup>43</sup> Donald C. Pennington, 'Being Wise After the Event: An investigation in hindsight bias,' *Current Psychological Research*, vol. 1, 1981, 271.

<sup>44</sup> Pennington, 'Being Wise After the Event,' 280.

<sup>45</sup> Debbie Osborn, [interview with Melissa Morrison], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

friend or familial groups. I also had no contact with people who protested or attended the games. It was necessary to find people who had been actively involved, either through protesting against the Tour or supporting it, in order to gain a real insight into why 'everyday New Zealanders' acted as they did in 1981. My aim was to talk to people who felt that the Tour had been a profound moment in their lives and thus could recount vivid stories and feelings from that time. It was therefore necessary to advertise to the general Christchurch public in order to find my participants.

I advertised for volunteers who would like to participate in the study in a number of local community newsletters as well as on the social media pages and websites of a number of community groups. This advertising was not as successful as I had anticipated. I only received eight phone calls or emails from people who were interested in being a part of the study. However, I was fortunate that one of my original advertisements was seen by a local reporter who contacted me about writing an article on my study and the call for participants. I was interviewed by Anna Price of the *Christchurch Mail* with the article being published on 28 July 2016.<sup>46</sup> An article was also written by Tom Doudney, of the *Christchurch Star*, which was subsequently published on the *New Zealand Herald* website.<sup>47</sup> This exposure within the local and national media was essential for me when it came to finding participants. Following the publication of these articles I was inundated with calls, texts, and emails from people who were interested in participating in the study as well as those who simply wanted to tell me their story. In total, I received 51 calls and emails and sent out a questionnaire to each respondent.<sup>48</sup> From the 51 questionnaires that were sent out 28 were returned completed. I then selected my participants based on their answers in these questionnaires.

I had a number of criteria which needed to be met in order for an individual to proceed through to the interview stage of the project. Participants needed to be aged from 50 to 65 to ensure that I was

---

<sup>46</sup> Anna Price, 'That Tour: Kiwis then and now,' *Christchurch Mail*, 28 July 2016, accessed 30 July 2017, <https://www.pressreader.com/new-zealand/christchurch-mail/20160728/281522225451090>.

<sup>47</sup> Tom Doudney, 'Christchurch student starts new research on Springboks Tour,' *New Zealand Herald*, 28 July 2016, accessed 30 July 2017, [http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c\\_id=1&objectid=11683123](http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11683123).

<sup>48</sup> Questionnaire attached in Appendix A.

working with the memories of one particular generation, those who were in their twenties at the time of the Tour. This is due to the fact that at this age people are beginning to form their own opinions and identities, thus they were deciding for themselves what their position on the Tour would be. Focussing on one particular generation ensured that my sample was more specific, and thus significant, because I was not attempting to analyse the memories of multiple generations as there was not enough scope to do so within this thesis. Participants were also required to be living in Christchurch during the Tour as this is the city which this thesis focusses upon. I also decided that because of time and cost considerations, participants needed to currently reside in Christchurch so that it was not difficult to interview them in person. My participants needed to represent people who opposed and supported the Tour in order to gain a balanced perspective. I also felt that it was important to interview police personnel as they played a significant role during the Tour by maintaining law and order. It was also necessary to interview both Māori and Pakeha in order to gather the perspectives of these two ethnicities. I believe that it was paramount to ensure that I interviewed Māori, who have been stereotyped within the historiography as being all anti-Tour because of Māori exclusion from mainstream New Zealand society. I therefore wanted to question whether this stereotype was actually correct. After looking through each of the questionnaires it became apparent that some of these criteria were not going to be as easy to meet as I had assumed. From the 28 returned questionnaires, seven respondents were not currently living in Christchurch or they had not lived in the city at the time of the Tour. This issue arose as a result of the *New Zealand Herald* article which did not specify that the study was focusing on Christchurch only. Another six respondents did not fit within the age criteria which I had established. This left me with 15 candidates to choose from. I only received one questionnaire from a former police officer (Leon Eccersall) and therefore he was automatically included. I also only received one questionnaire from someone who identified as Māori (Kevin Taylor) and thus included him as well. I decided that it was necessary to have a similar number of people who opposed the Tour and supported it in order to ensure that there was no apparent bias within the study's sample. In order to select the remainder of my participants, I placed them into their

respective group of for and against the Tour and from there I looked at each of their answers in the questionnaire, particularly the narrative section where they had been able to write comments on their experiences and memories. When looking at these questionnaires I concentrated on what I thought each participant could give me in an interview based on what they had written. I therefore selected people who had written more and thus could provide me with more information in an interview. I originally selected 12 people to interview, however as a result of time constraints I only interviewed 11 of these people. Those who supported the Tour included: Leon Eccersall, Kevin Taylor, Tim Hobbs, Michael Ward, and Brian Hays. Whilst Christine Beardsley,<sup>49</sup> Brent Burnett-Jones, Chris Smith, William Anderson, Jocelyn Papprill, and Debbie Osborn opposed the Tour. Three of the interview participants requested that a pseudonym was used instead of their real names, whilst two questionnaire respondents wished to remain anonymous. It was the personal preference of these participants that their real names were not used and thus pseudonyms were chosen in order to protect their identity. Participants were also given the opportunity to place an embargo on their raw data (interview recording and transcript) and the final thesis, however none of the participants requested to restrict access to this material.

I acknowledge that there is a distinct lack of female voices in this study who supported the Tour in comparison to those who opposed it. This should not be considered representative of the type of people who supported the Tour. They were not all male, just as those who opposed it were not all female. I simply did not receive a questionnaire from any females who supported the Tour and this is why women are not represented on this side of the issue. I also must acknowledge my lack of Māori participants. I was fortunate that Kevin decided to be a part of the study as he provided his valuable perspective. However, only having one Māori participant has created issues when it comes to

---

<sup>49</sup> I selected Christine Beardsley despite the fact that she was not within the original age bracket. Christine was 66 at the time of the interview and therefore fell outside of the age bracket that I had established in my criteria. However, I decided to include her because she had written extensively about her experiences on the day of the first test match in Christchurch and I therefore believed that she would be an interesting person to interview; Christine Beardsley, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 30 August 2016.

analysing how Māori acted during the Tour. It is difficult to make any steadfast conclusions without a larger Māori sample and I have therefore ensured that I do not make any sweeping statements about Māori during the Tour. Instead, I reinforce that Kevin's opinion was his own and he had his personal reasons for his actions and behaviour. I also only interviewed one police officer, Leon. Again, I cannot make grand statements about the police, however, using written personal testimony from other police officers ensured that I could verify what Leon was saying and could make some conclusions in regards to the role of police during the Tour.

After selecting my participants, I met with each of them either in their homes or local cafes in order to explain my research project in-depth and give them the opportunity to ask any questions. An interview time and place was then arranged. Interviews primarily took place in the participants' own homes as ensuring that participants are in familiar places where they feel comfortable aligns with international best practice for conducting oral history interviews.<sup>50</sup> Interviews were semi-structured, meaning that I did have a list of questions, which were somewhat tailored for each participant based on their questionnaire and position on the Tour, however these questions were primarily used as prompts only.<sup>51</sup> The majority of interviews were conversational, appearing as informal discussions, rather than strict question and answer sessions. The informality of the interviews was a result of conducting them in the homes of participants where they were comfortable and therefore more open. I also focussed on my participants' backgrounds and upbringings at the beginning of the interview as I found that this helped people to get talking, feel more comfortable with me, and thus open up. This was especially pertinent in my interview with Leon as I asked him some quite difficult questions about the police and their use of force. He may not have been as willing to open up about these difficult topics if we had not had this background discussion first. I kept a reflective journal during the interview process where I recorded any thoughts about the preliminary meetings and interviews. Notes on the preliminary meetings were incredibly valuable as I was able to assess how well I had gotten along with

---

<sup>50</sup> Ritchie, *Doing Oral History*, 61.

<sup>51</sup> Interview questions attached in Appendix B.



the participant and if a relationship had been established. If no rapport was established it meant that I needed to ask more background questions at the beginning of the interview in order to get participants to open up and become more comfortable talking to me. This journal also enabled me to critique how I conducted each interview so that I could improve, if necessary, for the next one.

One thing to note from the interview process is that meeting in a person's home, rather than a meeting room at the University of Canterbury, provided a much more comfortable and relaxed environment. I found that people were more likely to comfortably disclose information, particularly about their emotions, when in a more informal setting that they were familiar with. Interviewing participants in a meeting room created quite a formal atmosphere and I feel that this resulted in a stricter question and answer format rather than a flowing conversation.

Each of the interviews were recorded and then transcribed verbatim. Once the interview transcriptions were completed they were sent to the respective participant in order for them to check and correct any issues, such as spelling and dates. The transcripts and original interview audio files will be deposited in the Oral History Collection at the Alexander Turnbull Library in Wellington. This will ensure that future researchers, and the general New Zealand public, will have access to what will be an invaluable primary source. This method conforms to the true oral history method as described by Donald Ritchie in that the interviews were recorded, transcribed, and will be archived in a library, thus allowing access by the public for posterity.<sup>52</sup>

\*\*\*

This thesis has been divided into five chapters. Chapter One establishes the setting for the subsequent chapters by exploring the history of rugby contact between New Zealand and South Africa prior to the 1981 Tour. This chapter challenges the myth that the 1960 tour, when the NZRFU once again refused to send Māori players to South Africa, was the flashpoint for the issues that arose in 1981. Greg Ryan

---

<sup>52</sup> Ritchie, *Doing Oral History*, 24.

has argued that 1937 is actually the point where the debate over rugby contact with South Africa began as this was when public awareness of the issue increased. However, the first rugby contact between the two countries, in 1919, set the precedent for the colour line to be enforced both in South Africa and New Zealand when it came to rugby tours. It is important to discuss the history of this sporting relationship from 1919 onwards in order to establish that the 1981 Tour did not occur in a vacuum. Rather, the 1981 Tour was such a contentious issue and resulted in extensive public backlash because of what had occurred in the past with regard to who could play for the Springboks and the All Blacks. This chapter also discusses the politics that affected rugby in these countries throughout the twentieth century and gives an insight into the publics' reaction to previous tours. Chapter One provides both a national and international history of sporting contact between New Zealand and South Africa. The next four chapters however, focus upon the Tour in Christchurch.

Chapter Two explores who opposed the Tour and who supported it. However, this chapter goes further than simply looking at the demographics of those involved with the Tour, as previous scholarship has done. Instead this chapter argues that there were no pre-determined factors, such as age, ethnicity, gender, or geographical location that influenced people's opinion on the Tour. Rather, protesters were young and old, Māori and Pakeha, and grew up in both rural and urban areas. Demographics had little influence over who supported or opposed the Tour. Rather, New Zealanders had specific reasons for their position on the Tour which were a result of their upbringings and personal values. People who protested cannot be stereotyped by their demographics, because a cross-section of New Zealand society was involved in the anti-apartheid movement. Likewise, the chapter argues that there is no stereotypical Tour supporter; instead a variety of factors influenced their decision to support the Tour.

Chapter Three discusses the tactics which were used by anti-apartheid demonstrators in order to convey to the Government, the NZRFU, and the wider New Zealand public, that a large number of New Zealanders did not want the Tour to proceed. This chapter challenges the idea that all

demonstrators resorted to acts of violence and vandalism in order to get their message across and stop the Tour. Violence and vandalism did occur during the Tour; however, this chapter argues that not all protesters were responsible for such extreme actions. Rather, only a small proportion of demonstrators resorted to such tactics and their actions should not be representative of the entire anti-apartheid movement in New Zealand.

Chapter Four explores the belief held by anti-apartheid demonstrators that every police officer used excessive force to ensure that the Tour proceeded. Throughout the Tour police were accused of over-reacting when attempting to stop protesters from breaching police lines. This chapter argues however, that the use of excessive force by the police was not a common occurrence during the Tour. Rather, police needed to maintain law and order and at times reasonable force was necessary to ensure that protesters did not break through police lines and get into violent confrontations with Tour supporters and rugby fans. This chapter concludes with a discussion surrounding the mental and emotional toll that the Tour had on police personnel as a result of what they were ordered to do during the Tour to maintain law and order and keep New Zealanders safe.

The final chapter discusses the impact and aftermath of the Tour on New Zealanders and New Zealand society. I argue here that the Tour did not necessarily impact negatively upon people's lives and relationships. Secondary literature has perpetuated the idea that the Tour caused great divisions throughout New Zealand society. This myth has become a part of the public's perception when it comes to the Tour. However, the country was not as divided as has been asserted. There were divisions amongst co-workers, friends, and family however; people also found support and comradeship within their established relationships. Where differences of opinion did exist, mutual respect and understanding were paramount to ensuring that relationships were able to survive the Tour. Furthermore, this chapter considers whether the Tour was in fact the watershed moment in New Zealand history that it has been touted as by some historians and the New Zealand public, by analysing the impact that it had on New Zealand society. It argues that rather than a loss of innocence,

New Zealanders experienced a loss of ignorance with regard to issues in New Zealand society, such as inequality and racism. These issues existed before the Tour, however they came to the fore of the New Zealand conscious as a result of the Tour.



Figure 1. A ticket for the first test match of the 1981 Springbok Rugby Tour of New Zealand, which was held at Lancaster Park in Christchurch.

[Source: Photograph by Melissa Morrison, ticket from the collection of L.A. Morrison.]

## Chapter One: From where it all began, 1919 to 1981

This chapter explores the history of rugby contact between New Zealand and South Africa prior to the 1981 Springbok Tour. It gives an overview of each tour held in New Zealand and South Africa from 1919 until 1976 and discusses the lead up to the 1981 Tour. In doing this it dismisses the myth that the 1960 All Black tour to South Africa was the starting point for the controversy surrounding rugby contact between the two countries, as has been described in the historiography of the Tour. Furthermore, it disputes Greg Ryan's argument that 1937 was the point where the debate over rugby contact with South Africa began. Rather, this chapter argues that the 1919 New Zealand Army Team's tour of South Africa was the beginning of the rugby contact issue, as this was when the precedent was set for the colour line to be enforced when it came to the selection of rugby teams playing in, and against, South Africa. At the same time, this chapter establishes the setting for what occurred in 1981. It is important to understand the wider context of the rugby relationship between New Zealand and South Africa in order to grasp why the 1981 Tour caused such controversy in New Zealand. 1981 did not occur in a vacuum, rather it was a result of what had occurred in the past between these two countries.

### Where did it all begin?

*"Almost without exception, accounts of the debate surrounding New Zealand sporting contact with South Africa take 1958-60 as the genesis of the controversy."* **Greg Ryan.**<sup>53</sup>

The historiography of the Tour places the origin of the debate surrounding sporting contact between New Zealand and South Africa as the 1960 All Black tour to South Africa. Scholars such as, Richard Thompson,<sup>54</sup> John Nauright and David Black,<sup>55</sup> and Malcolm Templeton,<sup>56</sup> believe that the debate

---

<sup>53</sup> Ryan, 'Anthropological Football,' 105.

<sup>54</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*.

<sup>55</sup> John Nauright and David Black, 'Hitting Them Where It Hurts: Springbok-All Black rugby, masculine national identity and counter-hegemonic struggle, 1959-1992,' *Making Men: Rugby and masculine identity*, ed. by John Nauright and Timothy J.L. Chandler, (London: Frank Cass, 1996).

<sup>56</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*.

began when the New Zealand public became more aware of the exclusion of Māori from rugby teams touring South Africa. In 1960 there was extensive public debate and protests from churches, universities, and trade unions which resulted in an official anti-tour organisation being established. This increase in public debate has been attributed to the fact that South Africa's racial policy of apartheid was being discussed on the international stage and in particular within the United Nations (UN) General Assembly.<sup>57</sup> Greg Ryan disputes the belief that the issue of sporting contact began in 1960. Instead he believes that the real origin of the debate was the 1937 tour.<sup>58</sup> At this time, there was substantial debate from Māori leaders throughout New Zealand and the New Zealand media regarding the exclusion of Māori from playing in South Africa.<sup>59</sup> Ryan therefore argues that the true origins of the issue began in 1937.

Within the historiography the level of interest and protest from the public appears to correspond with the importance of an individual tour to the overall issue of sporting contact with South Africa. However, if the earlier tours are not discussed then the context of why 1937 and 1960 were of public interest at the time, are not known and understood. Tours prior to 1937 and in the intervening years before 1960 established a number of precedents that are important to understand in order to comprehend why the events of later tours occurred. The precedents which were set by the NZRFU and the New Zealand Government, to allow South African laws and customs to dictate who could be selected, established the setting for the exclusion of Māori in 1937 and 1960. The issue of sporting contact between New Zealand and South Africa therefore actually began in 1919 when Māori were excluded at the request of the SARB. The New Zealand Government's refusal to make a stand against such a request also set the precedent for non-intervention by governments in sporting issues in later years.

---

<sup>57</sup> Ryan, 'Anthropological Football,' 105.

<sup>58</sup> Ryan, 'Anthropological Football,' 105.

<sup>59</sup> Ryan, 'Anthropological Football,' 105.

### The New Zealand Army Team Tours South Africa

The first precedent for the exclusion of Māori, or those classified as 'coloured' within South Africa, was set in 1919 when the New Zealand Army rugby team toured South Africa following the First World War. The team was invited to tour, on their way home, by the High Commissioner to South Africa in London, William Schreiner.<sup>60</sup> Before their arrival, the SARB discovered that the team included two 'coloured' players, Corporal P. Tureia, a member of the Pioneer Māori Battalion, and Sergeant Nathaniel 'Ranji' Wilson who belonged to the New Zealand Rifle Brigade and was of West-Indian descent.<sup>61</sup> It was believed that their presence in South Africa could cause political harm and the overall tour could be jeopardised.<sup>62</sup> The SARB therefore requested that these two players be excluded from the team.<sup>63</sup> Schreiner was ordered to contact the New Zealand team and inform them that Tureia and Wilson were to be excluded if the tour were to continue.<sup>64</sup> The New Zealand team's management complied with this request and therefore set the precedent for race becoming a factor in the selection of teams playing against South Africa. Furthermore, the 1919 tour also set the precedent for New Zealand teams accepting the requests of the SARB as to who could play against South African teams. The historiography largely ignores this tour, most likely due to the fact that it was not an All Blacks tour or a representative New Zealand team. Rather, this 1919 team was a New Zealand Army team and was therefore not associated with the NZRFU. The historiography's focus is on the relationship between the All Blacks and Springboks which is why the 1919 Army tour is not extensively discussed.

Due to the lack of public comment on this tour at the time, it is not seen as a pivotal moment within the historiography. The reasons for the 1937 and 1960 tours being seen as the genesis of the debate is due to the amount of public interest in these tours and the exclusion of Māori from them. 1919 is

---

<sup>60</sup> 'New Zealand Rugby Tour,' *New Zealand Herald*, 31 July 1919, 7. Available from: PapersPast, accessed 20 February 2017, and Palenski, *Rugby*, 179.

<sup>61</sup> Malcolm Mulholland, 'Parekura Tureia,' last updated 27 January 2015, <http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/photograph/39619/parekura-tureia>.

<sup>62</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 179.

<sup>63</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 179.

<sup>64</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 179.

perhaps forgotten about because there was almost no public comment on the exclusion of Tureia and Wilson. This was due to the fact that the real reasons for their exclusion from the team were kept hidden from the wider New Zealand public. Instead the public were told that Tureia had simply missed the ship and so came back to New Zealand instead.<sup>65</sup> Wilson did travel to South Africa, however he was not able to go ashore due to South Africa's racial attitudes towards Indians.<sup>66</sup> If the public had known about the real reasons behind their exclusion there may have been some sort of public outcry such as that which occurred in 1960. This perhaps explains why the New Zealand Government decided to keep the real reasons from the New Zealand public. They did not want to have to deal with any possible public backlash nor defend their decision to exclude Tureia and Wilson at the request of the SARB. Despite, Templeton's belief that 1960 was when the debate of sporting contact truly began, he does acknowledge that the precedent for excluding Māori players was set in 1919.<sup>67</sup> Rugby historian Ron Palenski's recent work has attempted to rectify the 1919 tour's omission from the historiography by discussing the precedent that was set during this tour.

Palenski believes that this tour was a missed opportunity for New Zealand to demonstrate its disapproval of the request to exclude Māori or 'coloured' players from its rugby team. Palenski states that if the team's management had refused to exclude the two players, and risked not touring at all, then the SARB and South African Government may have acknowledged the fact that their racial attitudes were not acceptable to New Zealanders.<sup>68</sup> This type of stand from the team would have been especially pertinent as the team was not connected to the NZRFU, but instead to the Army and thus the New Zealand Government.<sup>69</sup> Instead the team complied with the request which according to Don Bruce, son of Alex Bruce who played with Wilson, was the "soft option," to take.<sup>70</sup> Bruce believes that a refusal by the team's management to exclude certain players because of their race could have set a

---

<sup>65</sup> *Poverty Bay Herald*, 5 November 1919, 2. Available from: PapersPast, accessed 20 February 2017.

<sup>66</sup> Booth, *The Race Game*, 23.

<sup>67</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 27.

<sup>68</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 183.

<sup>69</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 183.

<sup>70</sup> Bob Luxford, *Alex the Bruce*, (Palmerston North: Rugby Museum Society, 1994), 17-18.



precedent for later tours when the issue once again arose.<sup>71</sup> This tour was therefore an important moment in the shaping of future sporting contact between New Zealand and South Africa. It allowed the colour line and the selection of teams on racial grounds to become a part of sport between New Zealand and South Africa without any objections from the New Zealand Government. As a result, the 1919 tour can be established as the origin for issues regarding sporting contact between New Zealand and South Africa. This tour set precedents which would be followed on subsequent tours and eventually resulted in a public backlash against the NZRFU, the New Zealand Government, and the SARB for allowing race to dictate who could play rugby.

### All Blacks versus Springboks 1921

The 1919 New Zealand Army team's tour of South Africa set the precedent for the colour line being enforced with regard to who could play in sports teams that toured South Africa. It was not known though how a South African team would behave towards Māori players in New Zealand until 1921.

The 1921 Springbok tour of New Zealand made the attitude of South Africans toward Māori exceptionally clear. Although no Māori players were included in the All Blacks, the Springboks did play a game against a New Zealand Māori team.<sup>72</sup> This game, played in Napier on Wednesday 7 September, resulted in controversy that marred what had otherwise been a successful tour.<sup>73</sup> Even before the game had begun the Springboks made their attitude towards Māori known by refusing to shake the hands of their opponents and turning their backs on a group who were performing a traditional Poi dance.<sup>74</sup> A news correspondent, Charles Blackett, who was travelling with the South African team, also made the team's feelings clear when he sent a cable to South Africa in which he lamented the fact

---

<sup>71</sup> Luxford, *Alex the Bruce*, 17-18.

<sup>72</sup> Arthur C. Swan, *History of New Zealand Rugby Football 1870-1945*, (Wellington: A.H. & A.W. Reed, 1948), 418.

<sup>73</sup> Swan, *History of New Zealand Rugby Football*, 418.

<sup>74</sup> R.H. Chester and N.A.C. McMillan, *The Visitors: The history of international rugby teams in New Zealand*, (Auckland: Moa Publications, 1990), 113.

that the Springboks were forced to play a team of “New Zealand Natives.”<sup>75</sup> Blackett wrote that the “spectacle [of] thousands [of] Europeans frantically cheering on band of coloured men to defeat members of own race was too much for the Springboks, who [were] frankly disgusted.”<sup>76</sup> The Springbok management attempted to divert attention away from the contents of the cable by questioning the unethical behaviour of the Post Office worker, who had intercepted the cable and leaked it to a local reporter.<sup>77</sup> However, by this stage, the New Zealand media and some senior Māori leaders were already analysing the contents of the cable.<sup>78</sup>

A *New Zealand Herald* correspondent who was travelling with the Springboks attempted to settle the matter, but his comments only fuelled the issue as the article appeared to excuse the attitudes of the Springboks. He wrote that South Africa was a country where the colour line was made very clear and that the visitors had not yet been in New Zealand long enough to fully grasp the position of Māori in New Zealand society.<sup>79</sup> Te Rangi Hiroa (Doctor Peter Buck) replied to this article by condemning the *New Zealand Herald* correspondent’s apparent excuse of the South Africans’ actions and comments.<sup>80</sup> Te Rangi also responded to the South Africans’ opinion that they had “suffered the indignity of playing a match against Māoris at Napier.”<sup>81</sup> Te Rangi stated that the Springboks had been the guests of the Taranaki tribes at a gathering in Waitara where they were greeted by the Honourable Doctor Maui Pomare – who held a medical degree and was a member of Cabinet.<sup>82</sup> Te Rangi wondered how the Springboks could not possibly have come to understand that Māori were respected in New Zealand

---

<sup>75</sup> Charles Blackett’s cable was originally published in the Hawkes Bay’s *Daily Telegraph* on 8 September 1921. It was subsequently published in other newspapers throughout New Zealand. The original *Daily Telegraph* article is not widely available and thus the *Otago Daily Times* piece on the cable is cited here. ‘The Colour Line,’ *Otago Daily Times*, 17 September 1921, 10. Available from: PapersPast, accessed 15 February 2017.

<sup>76</sup> ‘The Colour Line,’ *Otago Daily Times*, 10.

<sup>77</sup> Zavos, *Winters of Revenge*, 49-50.

<sup>78</sup> Zavos, *Winters of Revenge*, 50.

<sup>79</sup> ‘Third Test Match,’ *New Zealand Herald*, 13 September 1921, 6. Available from: PapersPast, accessed 15 February 2017.

<sup>80</sup> Peter Buck, ‘Springboks and Maoris,’ *New Zealand Herald*, 14 September 1921, 8. Available from: PapersPast, accessed 15 February 2017.

<sup>81</sup> Buck, ‘Springboks and Maoris,’ *New Zealand Herald*, 8.

<sup>82</sup> Buck, ‘Springboks and Maoris,’ *New Zealand Herald*, 8.

having met Pomare who was held in such high-esteem.<sup>83</sup> Te Rangi therefore argued that they had failed to appreciate the differences between Māori in New Zealand and black South Africans at home. Rather they had applied their own “local prejudices to entirely different circumstances” here in New Zealand.<sup>84</sup> Te Rangi continued that it was incredibly disrespectful to have the colour line applied to Māori by rugby players from another country.<sup>85</sup> He concluded that if an apology was not forthcoming or if further comments were made regarding the colour line in New Zealand then the NZRFU should not invite them to tour again in order to show support and protect Māori players.<sup>86</sup>

Another protest against the original cable was published in the *Auckland Star* by members of the Arawa Tribe, who had hosted the Springboks at their marae. The Arawa Tribe wrote that they regretted having entertained the team if it were true that the Springboks had objected to playing against Māori.<sup>87</sup> If the tribe had known the teams’ true feelings towards Māori people, then they would not have extended their hospitality to them. The telegram stated that, if the Springboks felt that way, it had been wrong of them to accept an invitation to Ohmemutu Marae, “to accept the welcome and break bread with our people, and then later insult them as you have done is not, according to Māoris, the mode adopted by honourable gentlemen.”<sup>88</sup> In response to the criticism from both Te Rangi and the Arawa tribe the Springboks’ manager, Harold Bennett, released a statement in which he disassociated himself and the team from Blackett.<sup>89</sup> He also stated that Blackett had apologised to the team and that he regretted what he had written.<sup>90</sup> This was not actually the case as Blackett made no such apology nor did he withdraw his comments.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Buck, ‘Springboks and Maoris,’ *New Zealand Herald*, 8.

<sup>84</sup> Buck, ‘Springboks and Maoris,’ *New Zealand Herald*, 8.

<sup>85</sup> Buck, ‘Springboks and Maoris,’ *New Zealand Herald*, 8.

<sup>86</sup> Buck, ‘Springboks and Maoris,’ *New Zealand Herald*, 8.

<sup>87</sup> ‘Maori and Springboks,’ *Auckland Star*, 14 September 1921, 7. Available from: PapersPast, accessed 16 February 2017.

<sup>88</sup> ‘Maori and Springboks,’ *Auckland Star*, 7.

<sup>89</sup> ‘Maoris and Springboks,’ *New Zealand Herald*, 15 September 1921, 4. Available from: PapersPast, accessed 20 February 2017.

<sup>90</sup> ‘Maoris and Springboks,’ *New Zealand Herald*, 4.

<sup>91</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 187.

The editor of the *New Zealand Herald* attempted to bring an end to the situation the following day. He wrote that he hoped the statement issued by Bennett would “have the effect of re-establishing good relations between the Māori and the visiting footballers.”<sup>92</sup> He concluded that there was no colour line within New Zealand society and that Māori were treated as equals to Pakeha both on and off the rugby field.<sup>93</sup> The matter, as described by the editor, was now considered closed.<sup>94</sup>

It also appeared as though no Māori players would ever be able to tour South Africa. At a Hawkes Bay Rugby Union meeting Wiremu Parata, the manager of the New Zealand Māori team, informed those in attendance that he had asked Bennett whether there was a chance of a Māori team touring South Africa.<sup>95</sup> According to the *Daily Telegraph* Bennett had replied that Māori players would struggle to find accommodation and he was going to insist that “no Māori should be included in any New Zealand team visiting Africa.”<sup>96</sup> There was no reaction from the media or the public to this final statement however, Bennett appears to have stayed true to his word as the first official All Black team to tour South Africa did not include any Māori players.

The 1921 Blackett cable has consistently been mentioned within the Tour historiography.<sup>97</sup> However, like the exclusion of Tureia and Wilson from touring South Africa in 1919, it is not seen in the earlier literature as an overly significant event within the larger issue of sporting contact between New Zealand and South Africa. It was not considered to be a flashpoint that ignited debate around the issue of race and sport and thus has not been focussed upon by scholars, such as Richard Thompson. Rather, Thompson only describes the cable and briefly mentions the media response to it.<sup>98</sup> He does not suggest that the cable had any impact on subsequent Springbok tours to New Zealand and the

---

<sup>92</sup> ‘Maoris and Springboks,’ *New Zealand Herald*, 4.

<sup>93</sup> ‘Maoris and Springboks,’ *New Zealand Herald*, 4.

<sup>94</sup> ‘Maoris and Springboks,’ *New Zealand Herald*, 4.

<sup>95</sup> *Daily Telegraph* (Hawkes Bay), 10 September 1921, 5, in Ron Palenski, *Rugby: A New Zealand history*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015), 186.

<sup>96</sup> *Daily Telegraph* (Hawkes Bay), 5, in Palenski, *Rugby*, 186.

<sup>97</sup> Thompson, *Retreat Against Apartheid*; Palenski, *Rugby*; Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*; Nauright and Black, ‘Hitting Them Where It Hurts;’ Ryan, ‘Anthropological Football,’ and Zavos, *Winters of Revenge*.

<sup>98</sup> Thompson, *Retreat Against Apartheid*, 12-13.

selection of teams. The lack of discussion in the earlier literature is most likely a result of the lack of public debate surrounding the cable at the time. It was not considered to be a significant event because there were very few public comments on the contents of the cable and when comments were made they came either from the New Zealand media or senior Māori leaders and iwi. More recent literature on the Tour, such as that by Templeton and Palenski, places greater emphasis on the Blackett cable and its consequences regarding the selection of players. It is important to emphasise the consequences of the cable as it effected future sporting contact between New Zealand and South Africa. Templeton also believes that as a result of the controversy surrounding the cable no Māori team would play the Springboks for another 35 years.<sup>99</sup> The cable – and its consequences – are therefore an important part of the history of the rugby relationship between New Zealand and South Africa and it is necessary that it is included and understood within the historiography of the Tour.

### 1928 All Blacks in South Africa

The exclusion of Māori from the 1928 All Black team that toured South Africa has also received only a brief mention within the historiography on the Tour. The omission of Māori players should have caused more public outcry in New Zealand, however there were only isolated protests from some members of the New Zealand public.

This was the first official All Black tour to South Africa with the test series ending in a draw, thus intensifying the rugby rivalry between the two countries. The exclusion of Māori from this tour came as a surprise to many New Zealanders and rugby players. Previous teams that had toured the United Kingdom and Ireland, in 1924 and 1925 respectively, had included three Māori players.<sup>100</sup> Yet these players had simply disappeared from the team that was sent to South Africa. The team that had toured in 1924/25 had been nicknamed the 'Invincibles' by the New Zealand press and public owing to the

---

<sup>99</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 29.

<sup>100</sup> Swan, *History of New Zealand Rugby Football*, 302 and 310.

fact that they did not lose a game.<sup>101</sup> It was therefore questioned as to why three players, who each contributed to the unbeatable team, were excluded from touring South Africa in 1928. One of these players, George Nepia, was at the time described as one of the finest full-backs in the world.<sup>102</sup> In response to his exclusion he stated that “the whole of New Zealand was indignant,” about the issue.<sup>103</sup> This statement was indeed correct although it took a while for New Zealanders to voice their opinions. It had been made clear in May 1927 by the NZRFU Chairman, Stan Dean, that Māori players would not be eligible for the tour.<sup>104</sup> The *Auckland Star* claimed that this decision had been made as a result of the issues surrounding the 1921 tour.<sup>105</sup> The NZRFU’s policy was not to select Māori in order to ‘protect’ them from South African’s attitudes towards Māori.<sup>106</sup> It is for this reason that the Blackett cable of 1921 was such a significant event as it impacted on the future selection of players for the All Blacks. According to the *Auckland Star* it was decided as early as 1925, by the NZRFU, that no Māori players would be sent as a result of South Africa’s laws and customs.<sup>107</sup> The *Auckland Star* stated that the NZRFU “executive realised that the viewpoints of South African residents from centres where the racial threat is a daily shadow must ... be considered.”<sup>108</sup> The NZRFU appeared to have bowed to pressure and allowed the SARB to dictate the selection of the New Zealand team. There is no evidence though that such a request by the SARB, to send an all-white team, was made.

The decision to send an all-white team on the basis that Māori were “ineligible” to trial caused a polarisation of opinion amongst New Zealanders.<sup>109</sup> Some New Zealanders questioned the ability of another country to dictate who represented them in their national team, while others asked how a

---

<sup>101</sup> Finlay MacDonald, *The Game of Our Lives: The story of rugby and New Zealand – and how they’ve shaped each other*, (Auckland: Viking, 1996), 45 and 47.

<sup>102</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 29.

<sup>103</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 14.

<sup>104</sup> ‘Rugby Football,’ *Auckland Star*, 31 May 1927, 10. Available from: PapersPast, accessed 12 February 2017.

<sup>105</sup> ‘Rugby Football,’ *Auckland Star*, 10.

<sup>106</sup> NZRFU, ‘Management Committee Minutes,’ 19 October 1927, in Greg Ryan, ‘Anthropological Football: Maori and the 1937 Springbok Tour of New Zealand,’ *Tackling Rugby Myths: Rugby and New Zealand society 1854-2004*, ed. by Greg Ryan, (Dunedin: University of Otago Press, 2005), 109.

<sup>107</sup> ‘Rugby Football,’ *Auckland Star*, 10.

<sup>108</sup> ‘Rugby Football,’ *Auckland Star*, 10.

<sup>109</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 29, and Palenski, *Rugby*, 216.

team that excluded Māori could actually represent New Zealand.<sup>110</sup> In a letter to the *Auckland Star* one reader stated that players should be selected on merit, not on the colour of their skin, “a New Zealand team should contain our best players, and without the Māoris it cannot do that; therefore, it should not be called a New Zealand team if the Māoris are excluded.”<sup>111</sup> This argument would be repeated in later years. Other New Zealanders sided with the views of the NZRFU in that Māori were being protected by not being selected due to how non-white people were treated in South Africa.<sup>112</sup>

The 1928 tour further set a precedent for the NZRFU to conform to the racial policies of South Africa when selecting a touring team. This tour is therefore an important moment in the history of New Zealand and South Africa’s rugby relationship yet it has received little coverage in the historiography. Templeton and Thompson mention the tour and briefly discuss the absence of any Māori players however, they then swiftly move on to discussing the 1937 tour.<sup>113</sup> Literature by Ryan and Palenski discusses the public debate that occurred at the time, and how the decision to exclude Māori resulted in an unrepresentative New Zealand team.<sup>114</sup> However, due to the brief nature of these debates Ryan believes that the 1928 tour was not a significant moment in the history of the sporting contact issue.<sup>115</sup> Nevertheless, this tour was an important moment as it set the precedent for the NZRFU placing more emphasis on the laws and customs of South Africa rather than the values held by New Zealanders. This was also the first tour where the NZRFU decided who should be selected. When the 1919 New Zealand Army team toured, they were requested to exclude players who were classified as coloured by the South African Government. It had been the Army and thus the New Zealand Government who had made the decision to accept South Africa’s request. In 1928, however, it was the NZRFU who were deciding to conform, not to an outright request by the SARB or South African Government, but to the country’s customs and laws. Thus, this tour was an incredibly significant moment as it established the

---

<sup>110</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 216.

<sup>111</sup> ‘Maoris and Africa,’ *Auckland Star*, 11 October 1927, 9. Available from: PapersPast, accessed 10 February 2017.

<sup>112</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 216.

<sup>113</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 29, and Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 14.

<sup>114</sup> Ryan, ‘Anthropological Football,’ 109, and Palenski, *Rugby*, 216.

<sup>115</sup> Ryan, ‘Anthropological Football,’ 109.

pattern for the NZRFU allowing the SARB to dictate who could represent New Zealand on the rugby field in South Africa.

### 1937 Springbok Tour of New Zealand

The next time the All Blacks and Springboks met was in 1937 in New Zealand. It is this tour that Ryan places at the heart of the controversy surrounding sporting contact between New Zealand and South Africa. This was due to the “extensive protest and public debate, dominated by many senior Māori leaders,” which occurred before the Springboks arrived in New Zealand.<sup>116</sup> Ryan cites the Arawa Confederation memorial as the reason why he believes that the debate over sporting contact began in 1937. The memorial to the NZRFU in July 1936 insisted that no Māori should be involved in any aspect of the Springbok tour. This included involvement both on and off the rugby field. The memorial stated that Māori were not to be asked to entertain or host the Springboks in order to protect them from any humiliation or ill-treatment by the visitors.<sup>117</sup> According to Ryan these requests opened up the debate from one which only concerned rugby to an issue that impacted on race relations as a whole.<sup>118</sup>

The NZRFU appeared hesitant to respond to the memorial immediately. Instead the New Zealand media made its opinions on the issue known with the *Press* calling on the NZRFU to make a stand. It commented on the position of Māori in New Zealand society stating that they were equal in every way to Pakeha on and off the rugby field.<sup>119</sup> The *Press* continued that if the Springboks did not respect this and chose to discriminate between the two races then they should not come to New Zealand.<sup>120</sup>

There was extensive support for the memorial from the wider Māori community as well. The Akarana Māori Association offered their support for the contents of the memorial. The Association itself cited the 1928 tour to South Africa when the NZRFU had refused to select any Māori players, thus drawing

---

<sup>116</sup> Ryan, ‘Anthropological Football,’ 105.

<sup>117</sup> ‘Maori Protest,’ *Press*, 24 July 1936, 10. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 24 January 2017.

<sup>118</sup> Ryan, ‘Anthropological Football,’ 105.

<sup>119</sup> ‘Maoris and the Springboks,’ *Press*, 27 July 1936, 8. Available from: PapersPast, accessed 10 February 2017.

<sup>120</sup> ‘Maoris and the Springboks,’ *Press*, 8.



the colour line in New Zealand rugby.<sup>121</sup> Meetings of Māori tribes at Ngaruawahia and Tuahiwi also resulted in support for the memorial and its proposals.<sup>122</sup> Furthermore, Princess Te Puea Herangi announced that there was a strong majority throughout the Waikato region who supported the proposal that Māori not be involved with the tour.<sup>123</sup> Not all Māori supported the memorial though as Te Arawa was criticised by numerous tribes and iwi. Te Ari Pitama of Tuahiwi stated that Māori in the South Island would have no problem playing against a South African team because they simply wanted to play rugby.<sup>124</sup>

The NZRFU finally responded in August 1936 with Stan Dean, the NZRFU Chairman, writing to Tai Mitchell of Te Arawa that the tour was purely a matter for rugby authorities, but stressing that the Springboks should conform to New Zealand's customs and practices in regards to race.<sup>125</sup> A meeting was held between the NZRFU and North Island Tribes in September to further discuss the issue. It was decided that the NZRFU would request that Māori were to be treated as equals.<sup>126</sup> The SARB replied that a game against a Māori team would be welcome, however, despite this agreement it was decided in November that no game would be played.<sup>127</sup> The explanation given to the public was that the Springboks would not have time to play against a Māori team due to this tour being shorter than previous tours.<sup>128</sup> According to Ryan, Dean was attempting to avoid further controversy by making this decision and by not informing the public of the true reasons behind it.<sup>129</sup> There was no public comment in regards to this decision. A number of Māori players did play for their provincial teams and one Māori player was included in the All Blacks for the second test match.<sup>130</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup> 'Arawas' Protest Support,' *Press*, 25 July 1936, 19. Available from: PapersPast, accessed 12 July 2017.

<sup>122</sup> Ryan, 'Anthropological Football,' 114.

<sup>123</sup> Ryan, 'Anthropological Football,' 114.

<sup>124</sup> 'Would Play if Asked,' *Press*, 25 July 1936, 19. Available from: PapersPast, accessed 12 July 2017.

<sup>125</sup> 'Springboks and Maoris,' *Press*, 7 August 1936, 15. Available from: PapersPast, accessed 10 February 2017.

<sup>126</sup> Ryan, 'Anthropological Football,' 119.

<sup>127</sup> Ryan, 'Anthropological Football,' 119.

<sup>128</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 253.

<sup>129</sup> Ryan, 'Anthropological Football,' 119.

<sup>130</sup> Ryan, 'Anthropological Football,' 120, and Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 30.

Ryan's belief that the origins of the sporting contact argument began in 1937 is correct if public awareness of the issue corresponds to the significance of a tour to the overall debate. Substantial discussion was generated by the Arawa memorial, particularly by senior Māori leaders and iwi. This was the first time that there had been considerable public opinion regarding the issue of race and sporting contact with South Africa. However, Ryan fails to acknowledge the importance of the events of 1921 and 1928 to the Arawa memorial. The memorial cited the events of these two tours as the primary reason for why the Arawa Confederation asked that no Māori be involved with the 1937 tour. The memorial referenced the events of 1921 and how Māori were treated by the visitors and that by asking the NZRFU not to select any Māori players they would be protected from the reoccurrence of such treatment.<sup>131</sup> The memorial also cited the 1928 tour when Māori players were excluded from being selected by the NZRFU. It stated that the NZRFU had supported the attitudes of the South Africans towards Māori when it made its decision and thus Māori had "suffered a further affront to their sporting instincts from within their own land."<sup>132</sup> As the events of 1921 and 1928 are referenced in the memorial they are therefore important to understand in order to comprehend the wider issue of sporting contact between New Zealand and South Africa and show that the start of the issue began well before the 1937 tour.

#### 1949 – Sir Howard Kippenberger makes his feelings clear

The next test series was scheduled for 1940. However, the outbreak of the Second World War resulted in the postponement of the tour which was eventually confirmed for 1949.<sup>133</sup> Once again, no Māori players were sent to South Africa, a decision which resulted in public condemnations of the NZRFU.<sup>134</sup> The decision not to send Māori players was made in August 1948 by the Rugby Union Council, who cited the domestic policies of South Africa as the primary factor for not sending any Māori players.<sup>135</sup>

---

<sup>131</sup> 'Maori Protest,' *Press*, 10.

<sup>132</sup> 'Maori Protest,' *Press*, 10.

<sup>133</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 275.

<sup>134</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 276.

<sup>135</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 276.

In a statement outlining the decision the council said that it “reaffirms its previous decision ... much as it is regretted, players to be selected to tour South Africa cannot be other than wholly European.”<sup>136</sup> The statement continued that the NZRFU had the backing of the Māori Advisory Board in this decision. This was not the case though as Wiremu Parata, Chairman of the Māori Advisory Board, stated that the issue had never been discussed by the Board and therefore the NZRFU had failed in its duty to discuss with them matters that affected Māori players.<sup>137</sup> The issue was brought further into public consciousness by the comments of Sir Howard Kippenberger, who was one of New Zealand’s most distinguished soldiers in World War Two.<sup>138</sup> He stated that, “I had Māoris under my command for two years ... and I am not going to acquiesce in any damned Afrikanders saying they cannot go. To hell with them.”<sup>139</sup> Kippenberger’s remarks were commended by Māori. Nonetheless, Kippenberger apologised for his “objectionable remarks” a few days later, thus undoing the good of his original comments.<sup>140</sup>

There were also protests by trade unions about the exclusion of Māori on racial grounds.<sup>141</sup> These protests, as noted by Palenski, were not of the same scale or organisation as would be seen in later years.<sup>142</sup> It was questioned by the media and the public, as to whether it was the NZRFU who had decided to exclude Māori or if the SARB had stated in its invitation that Māori were not welcome.<sup>143</sup> The NZRFU did not respond to these questions but later stated that its policy towards sending Māori was established in order to protect them from visiting a country that strongly drew the colour line in all aspects of life.<sup>144</sup> This was especially so as the colour line had become even more pronounced when

---

<sup>136</sup> *Press*, 6 August 1948, in Richard Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid: New Zealand’s sporting contacts with South Africa*, (Wellington: Oxford University Press, 1975), 15.

<sup>137</sup> *Press*, 9 August 1948, in Richard Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid: New Zealand’s sporting contacts with South Africa*, (Wellington: Oxford University Press, 1975), 15.

<sup>138</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 276-277.

<sup>139</sup> *Evening Post*, 2 September 1948, in Ron Palenski, *Rugby: A New Zealand history*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015), 277.

<sup>140</sup> *New Zealand Herald*, 3 September, 1948, in Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998), 30.

<sup>141</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 30, and Palenski, *Rugby*, 276.

<sup>142</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 276.

<sup>143</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 16.

<sup>144</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 16, and Palenski, *Rugby*, 279.

the Nationalist Party was elected in June 1948.<sup>145</sup> The Nationalist Party brought in additional restrictions and laws that further segregated South Africa.<sup>146</sup>

Furthermore, a meeting between the Māori Advisory Board and the NZRFU in September reaffirmed the decision not to send Māori players with a statement released saying that the decision had been approved by all of the Māori elders at the time.<sup>147</sup> The team departed for South Africa in April 1949, leaving behind a number of talented Māori players. Prime Minister Peter Fraser stated upon their departure regret for having to exclude Māori however, it was beyond his control.<sup>148</sup> This statement by the Labour Leader appears to have set a precedent for the New Zealand Government to refuse to get involved in sporting matters.

Within the historiography the 1949 tour is only discussed with regard to Sir Howard Kippenberger's remarks on the exclusion of Māori. Kippenberger was a hugely prominent individual within New Zealand society at the time and so his remarks generated substantial public comment on the issue. Thompson, Templeton, and Palenski focus on Kippenberger's comments and the response from the New Zealand public.<sup>149</sup> Within the historiography this aspect of the 1949 tour appears to be the most significant. However, Palenski alludes to the fact that this tour was also important as it resulted in the first public protests against rugby contact, as well as the regret felt by the New Zealand Prime Minister for being unable to act.<sup>150</sup> Kippenberger's remarks are important, but the public protests and the precedent set by Prime Minister Peter Fraser, are far more significant due to the fact that these same events and issues would occur during later tours. It is therefore necessary to understand where the

---

<sup>145</sup> Brian Lapping, *Apartheid: A History*, (London: Grafton Books, 1986), 97.

<sup>146</sup> For further reading on apartheid in South Africa: Lapping, *Apartheid*; Rodney Davenport and Christopher Saunders, *South Africa: A modern History*, fifth edn., (London: Macmillan Press, 2000); and *Apartheid: The facts*, (London: International Defence and Aid Fund, 1983).

<sup>147</sup> *Southern Cross*, 2 October 1948, in Richard Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid: New Zealand's sporting contacts with South Africa*, (Wellington: Oxford University Press, 1975), 18.

<sup>148</sup> *New Zealand Herald*, 12 April 1949, in Ron Palenski, *Rugby: A New Zealand history*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015), 280.

<sup>149</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 15-16; Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 30, and Palenski, *Rugby*, 276-277.

<sup>150</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 277 and 280.

idea for protests against sporting contact originated from, as well as who was the first Prime Minister to set the precedent for not getting involved in sporting issues. This precedent is particularly important as it contributed towards the unwillingness of the Robert Muldoon Government in 1981 to get involved with the Springbok Tour issue.

### Success for the All Blacks in 1956

Little has been written about the 1956 Springbok tour of New Zealand in the historiography as there was very little controversy and protest surrounding the tour. This was because there was a “national need” for the All Blacks to beat the Springboks following the devastating loss of the last test series in South Africa.<sup>151</sup> The desire to win therefore outweighed the need to protest against the colour line being implemented in New Zealand. Everyone appeared to be passionate about the tour with thousands of people lining the streets attempting to get a glimpse of the Springbok team.<sup>152</sup> The image that is conjured up by this description is in stark contrast to the photographs of people protesting in their thousands against the 1981 Tour. The All Blacks finally secured their first test series win against the Springboks in 1956 with the tour being hailed a success.<sup>153</sup> The Springboks also played against a New Zealand Māori team for the first time since 1921. Thompson argues that some officials were afraid that racial conflict might once again mar the tour and it is alleged that the Māori side were warned before the game to behave themselves.<sup>154</sup> However, the game was considered successful despite the win going to the Springboks.<sup>155</sup> This tour is an important moment within the New Zealand and South Africa rugby relationship due to the fact that it gave the appearance that the issue of race and the colour line had been resolved or could at least be ignored. A game between the Springboks and a New Zealand Māori team had been successfully played without controversy, however the 1960 tour to South Africa proved that the issue was more contentious than ever.

---

<sup>151</sup> ‘All Blacks versus Springboks,’ accessed 15 February 2017, <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/culture/1981-springbok-tour/all-blacks-vs-springboks>, and Palenski, *Rugby*, 289.

<sup>152</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 289.

<sup>153</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 301.

<sup>154</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 18.

<sup>155</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 18.

### 1960 – ‘No Māoris, No Tour’

In 1959 the All Blacks received an invitation to tour South Africa the following year. The NZRFU announced that it would follow the same policy in regards to the selection of players for the tour meaning that no Māori would be included.<sup>156</sup> The NZRFU claimed that this decision was made at the discretion of the Rugby Union Council and that there was no input from the SARB.<sup>157</sup> It also stated that in making the decision the Māori Advisory Board had been thoroughly consulted.<sup>158</sup> Despite this insistence that the decision had been made solely by the NZRFU, communications between Cuthbert Hogg, the Chairman of the NZRFU, and the SRAB's Chairman, Danie Craven, prove otherwise. Craven wrote that although the Springboks had nothing against Māori and that they would be treated with respect by the team there were no assurances that the rest of the South African public would do the same.<sup>159</sup> Craven insisted that the same policy as used for past tours should be implemented once again.<sup>160</sup> This communication demonstrates that the decision was not solely that of the NZRFU – external factors were influencing the decision not to send Māori players.<sup>161</sup>

It is clear why the 1960 tour is cited as the starting point for the debate surrounding sporting contact with South Africa when looking at the substantial public discussion over the exclusion of Māori. Churches, university students, and trade unions, as well as the wider New Zealand public, expressed their anger and dismay at the NZRFU's decision to exclude Māori from the All Blacks. This was in contrast to previous tours where there was little to no comment from the wider New Zealand public. As Ryan notes, the condemnations of the NZRFU for excluding Māori, prior to 1960, came from Māori themselves.<sup>162</sup> This time though there was a considerable rise in public comment on the issue which

---

<sup>156</sup> New Zealand Press Association, 12 June 1959, in Richard Thompson, *Race and Sport*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), 41.

<sup>157</sup> *Evening Post*, 12 June 1959, in Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998), 31.

<sup>158</sup> *Evening Post*, in Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 31.

<sup>159</sup> Danie Craven, 'Letter of 23 October 1958, from Hogg to Craven, reply of 10 November 1958,' in Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998), 32.

<sup>160</sup> Craven, 'Letter of 23 October 1958,' in Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 32.

<sup>161</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 32.

<sup>162</sup> Ryan, 'Anthropological Football,' 116.

is why it is seen by many historians as the beginning of the debate over sporting contact with South Africa. Thompson discusses the reaction of the churches towards the NZRFU's decision to once again exclude Māori before detailing the protest tactics used by the Citizen's All Black Tour Association (CABTA).<sup>163</sup> While Nauright and Black also look at the period, which includes the 1960 tour, when the world and New Zealanders began to call for a sports boycott against South Africa.<sup>164</sup> Thompson, Nauright and Black, and Templeton believe that the origin of the debate over sporting contact began with the 1960 tour because of the public debate surrounding the exclusion of Māori.

Templeton attributes this increase in public debate to the fact that South African racial policies were being discussed and debated on the international stage by the UN General Assembly.<sup>165</sup> Ryan believes that the increase in public debate at the time was a result of the "consolidation of apartheid" in 1948, which meant that sporting contact with South Africa "became an arena of international significance, rather than one of domestic jurisdiction."<sup>166</sup> As a result of this, increasing numbers of New Zealanders were becoming aware of the issues and therefore felt that they needed to do something to stop the colour line being imposed upon New Zealanders whilst playing rugby in South Africa. Some of the first groups to comment on the NZRFU's decision were the Christian denominations of New Zealand. Church leaders warned against the dangers of racial prejudice and stated that only the merit of a player should be considered when selecting the team.<sup>167</sup> The statement continued that if Māori players were selected then it should be the responsibility of the SARB to ensure that they were shown respect and treated equally.<sup>168</sup> It concluded that if the SARB could not guarantee these requests then no team should travel to South Africa.<sup>169</sup>

---

<sup>163</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 18-23.

<sup>164</sup> Nauright and Black, 'Hitting Them Where It Hurts.'

<sup>165</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 30.

<sup>166</sup> Ryan, 'Anthropological Football,' 105.

<sup>167</sup> New Zealand Press Association, 8 June 1959, in Richard Thompson, *Race and Sport*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), 41.

<sup>168</sup> New Zealand Press Association, 8 June 1959, in Thompson, *Race and Sport*, 41.

<sup>169</sup> New Zealand Press Association, 8 June 1959, in Thompson, *Race and Sport*, 41.

University students and academic staff held protest marches and CABTA was formed.<sup>170</sup> As noted by Templeton this was the first time that public dissent came through such organised channels.<sup>171</sup> The protesters slogan was 'No Māoris, No Tour,' thus they were focussing on the NZRFU's apparent willingness to comply with South Africa's request that Māori be excluded.<sup>172</sup> This was in contrast to later protests which focused on the racial policies as a whole. CABTA organised a petition which was signed by over 162,000 people and was presented to the Government.<sup>173</sup> This petition and other protests by the New Zealand public did not change Prime Minister Walter Nash's mind. Instead Nash confirmed the Labour Party's policy of 'non-interference' in sport.<sup>174</sup> The Minister of Māori Affairs, Eruera Tirikatene, spoke out against this policy and the NZRFU's decision. Tirikatene believed that now was the time for New Zealand to take a stand and refuse to accept the racial policies of South Africa.<sup>175</sup> Nash and the NZRFU did not listen to Tirikatene's advice.

Public outcry and protests increased in March 1960 following the Sharpeville Massacre in South Africa.<sup>176</sup> Police killed 69 peaceful protesters who were demonstrating against the pass laws, which controlled the movement of black South Africans.<sup>177</sup> The NZRFU announced that they were monitoring the situation under the orders of Nash, who stated that following the massacre it was his opinion that unless tensions decreased in South Africa the All Blacks should not tour.<sup>178</sup> However, in a statement released in April, Nash confirmed that the decision still lay with the NZRFU as to whether the tour

---

<sup>170</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 31, and M.P.K Sorrenson, 'Uneasy Bedfellows: A survey of New Zealand's relations with South Africa,' *New Zealand, South Africa, and Sport: Background papers*, (Wellington: New Zealand Institute of International Affairs, 1976), 53.

<sup>171</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 31.

<sup>172</sup> Malcolm Maclean, 'Football as Social Critique: Protest movements, rugby and history in Aotearoa, New Zealand,' *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 17, no. 2-3, 2000, 256. Available from: Taylor and Francis Online, accessed 15 June 2016.

<sup>173</sup> Sorrenson, 'Uneasy Bedfellows,' 53.

<sup>174</sup> Sorrenson, 'Uneasy Bedfellows,' 53.

<sup>175</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 34.

<sup>176</sup> John Nauright and David Black, 'New Zealand and International Sport: The case of All Black-Springbok rugby, sanctions and protest against apartheid 1959-1992,' *Sport, Power and Society in New Zealand: Historical and contemporary perspectives*, ed. by John Nauright, (Sydney: Australian Society for Sports History, 1995), 75.

<sup>177</sup> Booth, *The Race Game*, 76.

<sup>178</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 40.



should go ahead.<sup>179</sup> It was eventually decided that the tour would continue and an all-white All Black team was sent.<sup>180</sup>

The extensive public debate surrounding the 1960 tour is why it has been established within the majority of the existing historiography as the starting point for the wider issue of sporting contact with South Africa. However, previous tours are also important when it comes to the issue of sporting contact as precedents were set that affected subsequent tours, including the 1960 tour. This tour is still important though as it set the precedent for organisations, protests and petitions being established and utilised to campaign against the exclusion of Māori from playing rugby in South Africa. Thousands of people marched throughout the country and an official protest organisation was formed, sparking a protest movement that would become more organised and effective in later years.

#### 1965 and Verwoerd's Loskop Dam Speech

Following the extensive protests surrounding the 1960 tour to South Africa, there were fears that the 1965 Springbok tour of New Zealand would be impeded by the anti-tour movement. The SARB was warned by the NZRFU that there was considerable opposition to the tour in New Zealand and that there was likely to be widespread protests.<sup>181</sup> The Citizens' Association for Racial Equality (CARE) urged people to boycott the games and the Federation of Labour President, T. E. Skinner, stated that attendance at any event related to the tour would be an endorsement of the apartheid system by New Zealanders.<sup>182</sup> As a result South African Prime Minister Hendrick Verwoerd, who was considered to be the architect of apartheid, remained relatively quiet about the possibility of Māori playing in South Africa in the lead up to the tour.<sup>183</sup> His refusal to comment on the situation may have been in an attempt not to further aggravate those who opposed sporting contact with South Africa.

---

<sup>179</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 42.

<sup>180</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 24.

<sup>181</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 35.

<sup>182</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 35.

<sup>183</sup> Nauright and Black, 'New Zealand and International Sport,' 75.

An all-white Springbok team arrived in New Zealand and were welcomed at Auckland Airport by a number of supporters as well as protesters, who were demonstrating against the exclusion of non-whites from the South African team.<sup>184</sup> Kobus Louw, manager of the Springboks, stated upon arrival that they were here to play rugby and that other issues were not of any concern to the team.<sup>185</sup> The Springboks received Māori hospitality at an East Coast marae, they played against a New Zealand Māori team, and there were several Māori players included in the All Blacks.<sup>186</sup> There were a number of protests, however they were restrained and did not impede the tour's progress.<sup>187</sup> The tour appeared successful in regards to the acceptance of Māori participation to the point where Louw and Craven stated that Māori would be welcome to play in South Africa in 1967.<sup>188</sup>

The 1967 tour proved to be a pivotal moment within the history of sporting contact between New Zealand and South Africa because it set the precedent for the first cancellation of a rugby tour between the two countries. This tour was cancelled by the NZRFU as a result of comments made by Verwoerd about apartheid and sport. Verwoerd's Loskop Dam speech was a response to the comments from Louw and Craven regarding the possibility of Māori playing in South Africa. In this speech Verwoerd reiterated the policy of apartheid and as a result diminished any hope of sending a fully representative All Black team to South Africa. Verwoerd specifically mentioned rugby and stated that all future teams that visited South Africa would be required to abide by its customs and laws, as was the case when South African teams visited other countries and honoured their customs and laws.<sup>189</sup> This made it clear that Māori would not be able to travel to South Africa with the All Blacks. In response, Prime Minister Keith Holyoake stated that, "it is the view of this Government that as we are

---

<sup>184</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 36.

<sup>185</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 36.

<sup>186</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 45.

<sup>187</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 318.

<sup>188</sup> *Johannesburg Star*, 14 August 1965, in Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998), 45, and *Dominion*, 2 September 1965, in Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998), 45.

<sup>189</sup> Hendrik Verwoerd, 'Loskop Dam Speech,' in Douglas Booth, *The Race Game: Sport and politics in South Africa*, (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1998), 89.

one people we cannot be fully and truly represented by a team chosen on racial lines.”<sup>190</sup> The NZRFU decided to cancel the 1967 tour as a result. The issues surrounding the 1965 tour and the resulting cancellation of the 1967 tour made it possible for rugby tours to be cancelled by the NZRFU if they believed that it would not benefit the country or rugby. This cancellation set an example that could have been followed by subsequent Governments and the NZRFU when it came to making decisions about later tours.

### The First Fully Representative All Black Team Tours South Africa

Following Verwoerd’s comments and the NZRFU’s cancellation of the 1967 tour it appeared unlikely that Māori would play rugby in South Africa whilst apartheid was in place. However, in 1966 Verwoerd was assassinated and replaced by John Vorster.<sup>191</sup> According to Nauright and Black, Vorster was a far more reasonable man than his predecessor and as a former rugby administrator he understood “the significance of international rugby to South Africa’s international relations and to the domestic morale of whites.”<sup>192</sup> Rugby and cricket were seen as a fundamental part of white South Africa’s culture and history.<sup>193</sup> According to Michael Ward, who worked in South Africa during the 1981 Tour, black South Africans predominantly played soccer.<sup>194</sup>

The big thing is that in South Africa, which I also didn’t realise until I got there, rugby is such a minority sport for the coloureds and blacks they’re really not interested in it. They’re all about soccer and they love soccer. You know they’re just always kicking a soccer ball around. Rugby they’re really not interested in.<sup>195</sup>

Rugby was therefore a sport that embodied the English-speaking white South African. It was used to imitate British cultural activities and to show their dominance over, and difference to, other South

---

<sup>190</sup> *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates*, volume 344, 7 September 1965, 2527. Available from: Hansard, accessed 23 June 2017.

<sup>191</sup> Nauright and Black, ‘Hitting Them Where It Hurts,’ 211.

<sup>192</sup> Nauright and Black, ‘New Zealand and International Sport,’ 76.

<sup>193</sup> Nauright and Black, ‘New Zealand and International Sport,’ 75.

<sup>194</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>195</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

Africans.<sup>196</sup> Maintaining international tours, particularly rugby, was vital. Vorster therefore believed that South Africa could no longer dictate to other countries who could be included in touring rugby teams.<sup>197</sup> Part of Vorster's decision to revoke some of the restrictions around the selection of teams was influenced by a visit from New Zealand's Deputy Prime Minister, John Marshall, in 1967. Marshall made it clear that no tour would take place in 1970 if Māori players could not be selected.<sup>198</sup> In order to continue the rugby relationship with New Zealand, and to stop South Africa from becoming further isolated within the international sporting sphere, Vorster had no choice but to alter South Africa's policies.<sup>199</sup> This turnaround allowed for the first fully representative All Blacks team to tour in 1970.

Buff Milner, Blair Furlong, Sid Going and Bryan Williams were the first Māori and Samoan players to tour South Africa with the All Blacks. However, conditions were placed on their inclusion within the team. During his meeting with Marshall, Vorster requested that the NZRFU were not to select too many Māori players and that those selected were not to be 'too black.'<sup>200</sup> The players were therefore considered by the SARB, the South African Government, and people to be 'honorary whites.'<sup>201</sup> This terminology was not well received in New Zealand. CARE objected to the tour taking place on the grounds that it was wrong for New Zealanders to support the exclusion of non-white South Africans from playing rugby as well as accepting an invitation "where Māori players are offered temporary white status" in order to play.<sup>202</sup> Another protest organisation, Halt All Racist Tours (HART) played a major role in organising protests and petitions against the 1970 tour.<sup>203</sup> These petitions did little to change Holyoake's mind, who stated that the Government was "not in the business of sport."<sup>204</sup> When

---

<sup>196</sup> Nauright, *Sports, Cultures and Identities in South Africa*, 77.

<sup>197</sup> Albert Grundlingh, 'Playing for Power? Rugby, Afrikaner nationalism and masculinity in South Africa, c.1900-c.1970,' *Making Men: Rugby and masculine identity*, ed. by John Nauright and Timothy J.L. Chandler, (London: Frank Cass, 1996), 195.

<sup>198</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 50.

<sup>199</sup> South Africa was barred from the 1964 and 1968 Olympics and thereafter was expelled from participating.

<sup>200</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 50.

<sup>201</sup> Malcolm MacLean, 'Anti-Apartheid Boycotts and the Affective Economies of Struggle: The case of Aotearoa New Zealand,' *Sports in Society: Cultures, commerce, media, politics*, vol. 13, no. 1, December 2009, 75.

Available from: Taylor and Francis Online, accessed 3 March 2017.

<sup>202</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 54-55.

<sup>203</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 56.

<sup>204</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 55.

the All Black team was finally selected for the tour the New Zealand media reported on the inclusion of the Māori and Samoan players. However, they were not noted for their inclusion but rather for their appearance and lack of Māori surnames.<sup>205</sup> Sports writer, Terry McLean, believed that the selection of these particular players conformed to Vorster's request that they were not 'too black,' thus giving the appearance of an all-white All Black team especially when coupled with the classification of 'honorary whites.'<sup>206</sup> As the team prepared to leave for South Africa there were mass demonstrations throughout the country. In Wellington, the confrontations between police and demonstrators became heated, with 46 people being arrested, whilst the team had to be escorted to Wellington Airport under police guard.<sup>207</sup>

This tour was seen as a turning point in the sporting relationship between New Zealand and South Africa due to the fact that Māori players were finally able to play in South Africa. This is what New Zealanders, particularly those involved with the anti-tour organisations, had been campaigning for since 1960 when the wider public became more aware of the issue. The inclusion of Māori was also what Māori tribes and spokespeople had, since 1937, believed was necessary for teams to be fully representative. It was an issue that stemmed back to 1919 when Tureia and Wilson were excluded from the New Zealand Army rugby team. After 51 years this issue had finally been resolved, however for New Zealanders, who were becoming increasingly aware of apartheid and the issues that it caused for black and coloured South Africans, the issue had now changed. It was no longer about the 'No Māoris, No Tour' movement, but about South Africa's racial policies as a whole and the All Blacks playing a South African team that was racially selected.<sup>208</sup> According to Thompson this issue was not new, it had simply been dominated by the more pressing issue for New Zealanders which was the exclusion of Māori.<sup>209</sup> CARE and HART also focussed on this issue and they questioned whether it was

---

<sup>205</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 58.

<sup>206</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 58.

<sup>207</sup> MacDonald, *The Game of Our Lives*, 92, and Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 58.

<sup>208</sup> MacLean, 'Anti-Apartheid Boycotts and the Affective Economies of Struggle,' 75.

<sup>209</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 56.

right for New Zealand to have sporting contact with a country that selected teams based on race. Templeton believes that New Zealanders began to question whether New Zealand should be involved with a country whose racial policies, both on and off the field, conflicted with the values held by New Zealanders.<sup>210</sup> 1970 was therefore the turning point in the issue of sporting contact with South Africa as the focus moved away from the exclusion of Māori to the exclusion and inequality that black and coloured South Africans experienced in South Africa.

### To Build Bridges or Intervene?

Jack Marshall, now Prime Minister, reaffirmed New Zealand's policy with regard to sporting contacts with South Africa. The Government would not interfere in the decisions of sporting bodies and instead would attempt to 'build bridges' with South Africa through sport.<sup>211</sup> Marshall believed that it would be better to maintain contact with South Africa in order to show them how well a racially inclusive society worked and rugby, where Māori and Pakeha played together successfully, was an effective way to illustrate this.<sup>212</sup> Templeton believes that Marshall's bridge-building statement actually implied support for the tour as Marshall wanted to use rugby to connect with South Africa.<sup>213</sup> This change in politics was in contrast to Holyoake's stance that his Government would not interfere in the decisions of sporting organisations.<sup>214</sup> Marshall attempted to enter into a dialogue with the NZRFU and the SARB about the possibility of multi-racial trials in South Africa. He believed that even if no black South Africans were selected if they had at least been able to trial then this might be seen as a compromise by the increasingly-active anti-apartheid movement.<sup>215</sup> However, Craven stated that mixed trials would not happen and there would be no changes to South Africa's policies.<sup>216</sup> It became increasingly

---

<sup>210</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 51.

<sup>211</sup> Jack Marshall, 'Statement on Relations with South Africa,' 7 March 1972, in Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998), 85-86.

<sup>212</sup> Thompson, *Retreat from Apartheid*, 76.

<sup>213</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 86.

<sup>214</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 86.

<sup>215</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 91.

<sup>216</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 92-93.

clear to the Government that if the planned 1973 Springbok tour of New Zealand went ahead there could be outbreaks of violence between demonstrators, police, and tour supporters.<sup>217</sup>

The 1972 General Elections saw a change in Government from National to Labour. During the election campaign, Labour leader, Norman Kirk, only briefly mentioned the upcoming 1973 tour stating that, if elected, his party would not intervene.<sup>218</sup> After Labour's win, though, Kirk changed his mind. There were a number of factors that influenced this change in policy including the announcement by the new Australian Labour Government that racially selected teams could not enter Australia.<sup>219</sup> This policy was in response to the civil unrest that had erupted during the 1971 Springbok tour of Australia.<sup>220</sup> Kirk was also presented with a number of reports which outlined why the Government should oppose the tour. One report discussed issues such as racial discrimination being against New Zealand's policies and morals as a country and that the argument regarding politics having no place in sport was unsustainable due to the fact that South Africa's policies dictated who could be selected for a sports team.<sup>221</sup> CARE also pointed this out as it was Vorster who had not allowed mixed trials to be held bringing politics irrefutably into sport.<sup>222</sup>

Perhaps the two most influential factors were the cost of the police resources that would be required to control any protests and the impact of the tour on New Zealand's international reputation.<sup>223</sup> New Zealand would be seen as a country that endorsed and supported the apartheid regime, thus putting the 1974 Commonwealth Games (which New Zealand was hosting) in jeopardy.<sup>224</sup> A number of African, Asian, and Caribbean countries were threatening to boycott the games if the tour went ahead.<sup>225</sup> The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Immigration began to look at options

---

<sup>217</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 337.

<sup>218</sup> MacDonald, *The Game of Our Lives*, 94-95.

<sup>219</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 99.

<sup>220</sup> MacDonald, *The Game of Our Lives*, 93.

<sup>221</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 99-100.

<sup>222</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 98.

<sup>223</sup> MacDonald, *The Game of Our Lives*, 95.

<sup>224</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 337.

<sup>225</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 337.

available to the Government if it decided to intervene. It was established that the Ministry of Immigration could refuse visas if it believed that the team's presence could cause issues to law and order.<sup>226</sup> A meeting was held in February 1973 between Kirk and Jack Sullivan, Chairman of the NZRFU, where Sullivan stated that he was unlikely to cancel the tour and would only do so if the Government asked him directly.<sup>227</sup>

### The Cancelled Tour

On April 6 1973, Kirk wrote to Sullivan stating that he was 'required' to withdraw the invitation to tour. He wrote, "the Government ... sees no alternative, pending selection on a genuine merit basis, to a postponement of the tour."<sup>228</sup> Public opinion surrounding the decision was divided with most simply being resigned to the decision. Study participant Brent Burnett-Jones recalled marching in protests against the 1973 tour as well and was quite pleased when Kirk decided to cancel it.<sup>229</sup> However, Kevin Taylor, a rugby supporter, was not happy with the decision but understood that it could have affected the Commonwealth Games which was very important to New Zealanders at the time.<sup>230</sup> In July, Kirk reaffirmed his party's new policy stating that the Government would oppose entry to teams from South Africa until there was "evidence that sport in South Africa was no longer organised on a racial basis."<sup>231</sup> However, teams would not be stopped from travelling to South Africa.

Templeton discusses this tour in great depth focusing on the political situation in New Zealand at the time. He outlines the factors which influenced Kirk in making his final decision, including the Police Commissioner's assessment of the required resources to police the tour and the possible impact on

---

<sup>226</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 102-103.

<sup>227</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 104-105.

<sup>228</sup> Norman Kirk, 'Letter to Jack Sullivan, 6 April 1973,' in Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998), 106.

<sup>229</sup> Brent Burnett-Jones, [interview with Melissa Morrison], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>230</sup> Kevin Taylor, [interview with Melissa Morrison], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>231</sup> 'Press statement from Prime Minister's Office, 19 July 1974,' in Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998), 113.



the Commonwealth Games.<sup>232</sup> The dedication of an entire chapter to this one tour illustrates that Templeton sees it as a defining moment in the rugby relationship between the two countries. In Palenski's recent book however, the cancellation of the 1973 tour receives very little attention. This is most likely a result of Palenski being a rugby historian and as no rugby was played between the All Blacks and Springboks, he does not cover the cancelled tour in depth. However, it is such a defining moment in the history of sporting contact between New Zealand and South Africa. The cancellation of the 1973 tour set the precedent for the New Zealand Government being able to decide whether a rugby tour in New Zealand should proceed if it was believed to be detrimental to the country. When the 1967 tour was cancelled the decision had been left to the NZRFU, although the Government and Holyoake fully supported the decision to do so. By contrast, the cancellation of the 1973 tour was decided upon solely by the Government, which reneged on the non-interference policy that Kirk had promised during the 1972 elections. Kirk decided that the issue of continued sporting contact with South Africa, whilst its racial policies were in place, was too large a decision for a sporting body to make considering the damaging effect that it could have on New Zealand society and the country's reputation.<sup>233</sup> Kirk therefore took control of the situation and cancelled the tour. Likewise, Robert Muldoon could have done the same thing in 1981, as the precedent had already been set for such a decision to be made.

### The Final Tour Before 1981

Following the cancelled 1973 tour an example had been set for the Government taking control of the situation and preventing South African teams from visiting New Zealand. For teams travelling to South Africa, however, there would be no-intervention. Bill Rowling, who took over the leadership of the Labour Party following Kirk's death in 1974, reiterated this in regard to the 1976 tour to South Africa.<sup>234</sup> Whether Labour would have kept this promise is unknown as they lost the 1975 election to National.

---

<sup>232</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 102-105.

<sup>233</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 106.

<sup>234</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 114.

In the lead up to the election, Muldoon, stated that a National Government would not intervene with any future rugby tours either in New Zealand or South Africa.<sup>235</sup> It is possible that this policy of non-interference, and the reneging of Labour's previous promise of non-interference before 1973, helped to secure victory for the National Party.

The UN Special Committee on Apartheid became concerned, after the election, that New Zealand would resume contacts with racially selected teams from South Africa. If this were to happen New Zealand would be harshly criticised and could become the focus of international pressure.<sup>236</sup> Other countries still had contact with South Africa at this time. But, it was a result of the place of rugby in New Zealand society that New Zealand would receive unwanted attention and could potentially become isolated.<sup>237</sup> Muldoon's Government appeared unconcerned with the Committee's thoughts on the issue. Abraham Ordia, President of the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa (SCSA), stated that if the 1976 tour went ahead then a number of African countries would boycott any sporting event that New Zealand participated in, including the Commonwealth and Olympic Games.<sup>238</sup> The policy of non-interference by the Government and the need for the NZRFU to continue rugby tours with South Africa was putting other sports in jeopardy. Muldoon once again stated that sporting bodies in New Zealand were free to make their own decisions, with the proviso that they needed to look at the wider implications.<sup>239</sup> The All Blacks departed for South Africa as planned. Despite increasing pressure from international organisations to make decisions regarding contact with South Africa Muldoon was reluctant to renege on his election promise of non-interference in sport. It was his inability to make a firm stand on the controversial issue that would see civil unrest on an unprecedented scale in 1981.

---

<sup>235</sup> MacDonald, *The Game of Our Lives*, 95-96.

<sup>236</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 121.

<sup>237</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 121.

<sup>238</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 122.

<sup>239</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 139.

### The lead up to 1981

Following the 1976 tour to South Africa there was uncertainty as to how sporting contact would continue between New Zealand and South Africa. The NZRFU were not in the position, financially, to send an All Black team to South Africa until the Springboks had toured New Zealand.<sup>240</sup> However, it appeared unlikely that the Springboks would be able to do so due to the anti-apartheid sentiment within New Zealand society. In order to ensure that the rugby relationship continued, South Africa's sporting policies needed to change. It was hoped that if South Africa's sports policies were reformed to the point where segregation was no longer explicitly prevalent then this would prevent the large-scale demonstrations and civil unrest that had been threatened by anti-apartheid organisations in New Zealand.<sup>241</sup> The South African Government therefore modified its existing sports policy in September 1976 in order to guarantee rugby contact.

Whether South Africa had any intention of using the sports policy as a starting point to bring about the end of apartheid is unclear. Instead, a more plausible theory is that the reforms were simply a way of ensuring continued contact with other countries. The reformed policy was similar to the original in that all races belonged to their own sporting organisation, but it differed with regard to the contact that these organisations could have with sportspeople and teams from other racial groups.<sup>242</sup> Rugby clubs could only organise games and events within their own racial group.<sup>243</sup> However, at international level players could be selected from different racial groups.<sup>244</sup> The change in policy was initially seen as a break-through in regards to abolishing apartheid.<sup>245</sup> However, the clarification that mixed-racial teams were only permitted at an international level led many to believe that changes were only

---

<sup>240</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 135.

<sup>241</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 363.

<sup>242</sup> 'The South African Government's Official 'Multi-national' Sports Policy,' in Robert Archer and Antoine Bouillon, *The South African Game: Sport and racism*, (London: Zed Press, 1982), 330.

<sup>243</sup> 'The South African Government's Official 'Multi-national' Sports Policy,' in Archer and Bouillon, *The South African Game*, 330.

<sup>244</sup> 'The South African Government's Official 'Multi-national' Sports Policy,' in Archer and Bouillon, *The South African Game*, 330.

<sup>245</sup> Robert Archer and Antoine Bouillon, *The South African Game: Sport and racism*, (London: Zed Press, 1982), 268.

cosmetic.<sup>246</sup> The first mixed trials were held in South Africa at the end of 1976. At that time, no black South Africans were selected due to their lack of ability.<sup>247</sup> This illustrates that the disadvantages due to the lack of facilities and proper coaching at the grassroots level was having an effect on black South Africans' opportunities to become a part of the national team. According to Templeton these reforms were not going to lead to equal opportunities overnight for all South Africans; more changes were required.<sup>248</sup> Rather, this policy was established in order to continue rugby contact with New Zealand and to appease anti-apartheid organisations whose actions were threatening future tours between the two countries.

### The Gleneagles Agreement

At the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting held in London in June 1977 Muldoon made it clear that sporting contact with South Africa should not be on the agenda for discussion as New Zealand's policy was clear and would not change.<sup>249</sup> Muldoon stated that a number of sporting organisations had consulted Government regarding the difficulties of maintaining contact with South Africa and as a result a number of sporting events had been cancelled.<sup>250</sup> The role of advisor to sporting organisations was as far as New Zealand was prepared to go and Muldoon felt this was reasonable as it appeared to be having some effect. Commonwealth Secretary-General Shridath Ramphal however, disagreed and stated instead that sporting contact would be discussed at the weekend retreat for the Commonwealth Heads of Government at Gleneagles. Following the retreat, the Gleneagles Agreement (the Agreement), formally known as the Commonwealth Statement on Apartheid in Sport, was signed.<sup>251</sup> Commonwealth Heads of Government were showing their "full support" for the campaign against apartheid by signing the Agreement and would endeavour to "discourage" contact

---

<sup>246</sup> Archer and Bouillon, *The South African Game*, 268-269.

<sup>247</sup> Archer and Bouillon, *The South African Game*, 268.

<sup>248</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 141.

<sup>249</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 147.

<sup>250</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 147.

<sup>251</sup> 'Commonwealth Statement on Apartheid in Sport,' London, 15 June 1977, 3, accessed 1 March 2017, [http://www.nzlii.org/nz/legis/hist\\_bill/gab1981791187.pdf](http://www.nzlii.org/nz/legis/hist_bill/gab1981791187.pdf).

with South Africa.<sup>252</sup> The Agreement stated that it was “the urgent duty of each of their Governments vigorously to combat the evil of apartheid by withholding any form of support for, and by taking every practical step to discourage contact or competition by their nationals with sporting organisations, teams or sportsmen from South Africa.”<sup>253</sup> In order to discourage contact Governments were to “determine in accordance with its laws the methods by which it might best discharge these commitments.”<sup>254</sup> Governments also needed to involve their national sporting organisations in order to fulfil their duty, as outlined in the Agreement, as it would not be possible to do so without the “understanding, support and active participation ... of their national sporting organisations and authorities.”<sup>255</sup> The Agreement concluded that by signing the statement Governments were committing to the fact that there would be no future sporting contacts with South Africa until apartheid was abolished.<sup>256</sup>

Following the release of the Agreement to the public Muldoon gave his interpretation of what it would mean for New Zealand. Muldoon stated that New Zealand would not refuse visas to visiting sports teams and people from South Africa and that this was in line with how Britain and Canada were also interpreting the Agreement.<sup>257</sup> When asked how New Zealand would enforce the Agreement, Muldoon replied that the Government had previously been discussing these issues with sporting organisations and they had had some success in persuading these organisations to cease contact with South Africa.<sup>258</sup> In Muldoon’s mind the Government was already doing everything in their power to discourage contact and that measures such as refusing visas were not necessary. In offering copies of the Agreement as well as providing “guidance” to sporting organisations the Government felt that it had fulfilled its commitment to the Agreement.<sup>259</sup> Muldoon was hesitant to discuss when sporting

---

<sup>252</sup> ‘Commonwealth Statement on Apartheid in Sport,’ 3.

<sup>253</sup> ‘Commonwealth Statement on Apartheid in Sport,’ 4.

<sup>254</sup> ‘Commonwealth Statement on Apartheid in Sport,’ 4.

<sup>255</sup> ‘Commonwealth Statement on Apartheid in Sport,’ 4.

<sup>256</sup> ‘Commonwealth Statement on Apartheid in Sport,’ 4.

<sup>257</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 150.

<sup>258</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 151.

<sup>259</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 154.

contacts with South Africa might resume and whether he believed that in order for this to happen the whole apartheid system would need to be abolished. Templeton hypothesises as to whether Muldoon saw it as necessary for apartheid to be abolished in all areas of South African life even though the Agreement did not just refer to apartheid in sport.<sup>260</sup> Furthermore, Muldoon believed that if apartheid was abolished in one particular sport then contact may be resumed with that sporting code.<sup>261</sup> African nations that had signed the Agreement saw the end of sporting contact with South Africa as a way of putting pressure on the entire apartheid system and therefore, as Templeton notes, they would not be pleased to learn that not all countries were interpreting the Agreement in the same way.<sup>262</sup> Frank Corner, New Zealand's Permanent Secretary of Foreign Affairs, was also concerned with Muldoon's interpretation of the Agreement. He believed that if it were argued that a certain sport was deemed to be racially integrated and thus contact could be resumed with that particular code then there could be issues as to how integration was measured.<sup>263</sup> The Agreement's purpose was to focus on the whole system of apartheid. Unfortunately, this was not how it was being interpreted by Muldoon.

One of the significant issues with the Agreement is that it was not legally binding. Foreign Affairs lawyers who studied the Agreement stated that it was not Commonwealth law, but rather "an important political commitment."<sup>264</sup> This clarification on its status meant that there was no way to ensure that countries enforced it. The Agreement had stated that the way in which individual countries seek to "discourage" contacts was to be in accordance with its own laws.<sup>265</sup> Muldoon was therefore, in no way compelled to refuse visas or to discourage contacts in any way that went against New Zealand laws. It was his policy of non-interference and his interpretation of the Agreement which meant that sporting contacts with South Africa would continue if he deemed certain requirements to

---

<sup>260</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 152.

<sup>261</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 152.

<sup>262</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 152.

<sup>263</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 152.

<sup>264</sup> 'Letter of 18 September 1981, from Secretary of Foreign Affairs to Ricard Long at the *Dominion*,' in Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998), 152.

<sup>265</sup> 'Commonwealth Statement on Apartheid in Sport,' 4.

be met. One of these requirements was the racial integration of a particular sport and following the reforms of rugby in the 1970s in South Africa this requirement was deemed to have been fulfilled by Muldoon.<sup>266</sup>

### The Invitation

A precedent to ignore the Agreement was set in early 1980 when the British Lions accepted an invitation to tour South Africa later that year.<sup>267</sup> There were fears from anti-apartheid organisations in New Zealand that the NZRFU might follow suit and invite the Springboks to tour New Zealand thus ignoring the Agreement and the advice of the New Zealand Government.<sup>268</sup> In an attempt to dissuade the NZRFU, Brian Talboys, the New Zealand Foreign Minister, stated that a tour would ruin the work that had been achieved thus far by New Zealand.<sup>269</sup> Talboys also reminded the NZRFU of its responsibilities under the Agreement. Despite this warning an invitation was issued in September 1980 for a Springbok tour of New Zealand in 1981.<sup>270</sup> The NZRFU clarified that the invitation had been issued to a merit-selected South African team and rejected claims that by having contact with South Africa it was condoning the policy of apartheid.<sup>271</sup> Furthermore, the NZRFU believed that changes to rugby in South Africa were more than just cosmetic as was claimed by anti-apartheid organisations. It outlined the reforms of the 1970s including the holding of mixed-trials which allowed racial integration at the national level and resulted in fully representative, merit-based teams.<sup>272</sup> The NZRFU stated that the Springbok team which was set to tour New Zealand had been selected on a strictly merit-basis following mixed trials. The team selectors had included two non-white rugby officials and the team would include one coloured player, Errol Tobias.<sup>273</sup> This confirmation that rugby had been successfully racially integrated in South Africa meant that the requirements as stipulated by Muldoon had been

---

<sup>266</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 154.

<sup>267</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 178.

<sup>268</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 178.

<sup>269</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 178.

<sup>270</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 179.

<sup>271</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 179.

<sup>272</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 179.

<sup>273</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

met. The Tour could therefore go ahead. The NZRFU's justification did not discuss the fact that the South African Rugby Union, which organised non-racial rugby and was composed mostly of black South Africans, had not merged with the other rugby unions and would not do so until teams and competitions could be organised between the different races at all levels.<sup>274</sup> The NZRFU stated that this issue could not be controlled by sporting bodies as it was an issue for the South African Government and thus the rugby unions had done all in their power to become racially integrated as far as the law allowed.<sup>275</sup> Finally, the NZRFU rejected any claims that a tour could impact negatively upon the 1982 Commonwealth Games. Rather the damage had already been done by the British Lions' tour of South Africa.<sup>276</sup> Public reaction to this invitation varied from anger to disbelief. Those who opposed apartheid were angry that the NZRFU appeared to be ignoring the morally abhorrent policy of apartheid in order to carry on playing a game.<sup>277</sup> However, rugby supporters believed that the NZRFU simply did not comprehend how the Tour would affect New Zealand society.<sup>278</sup> It was at this point that oral history participants began to take notice of what was happening with regard to the possibility of a tour in 1981, they were therefore able to make comments on the invitation which was issued to the Springboks:

I was gonna say disappointed with the Rugby Union, but I think it was more than that. I think I expected them to do what they did and what they said so I guess I despised them quite a lot actually. **Anti-apartheid demonstrator Christine Beardsley.**<sup>279</sup>

I think they were perhaps a wee bit archaic, naïve perhaps in a lot of their thoughts. Probably sort of run by a lot of older people who had been around a few years and didn't perhaps totally understand what they were really [going to] get themselves in for. I think that probably was a

---

<sup>274</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 179.

<sup>275</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 179.

<sup>276</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 179.

<sup>277</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016; Chris Smith, [interview with Melissa Morrison], Christchurch, 11 October 2016, and Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>278</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>279</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.



wee bit of the problem and getting people on their side and getting people to understand what was going on. I think they just thought oh yes this is gonna be a breeze we'll let the police sort it out. [It] ended up being a lot worse than they imagined. **Rugby supporter Michael Ward.**<sup>280</sup>

The Government expressed regret and disappointment that the NZRFU had decided to invite the Springboks. While Ramphal stated that the invitation would be seen as a "proclamation of alignment with apartheid" as well as an act of contempt towards the Agreement.<sup>281</sup> Talboys issued a statement in which he explicitly said that the NZRFU were putting New Zealand at risk by only thinking about their own interests. He wrote, "[i]f they stay with their selfish decision, not only they but the whole country will have to live with the consequences."<sup>282</sup> It was these consequences which were of great concern to both the Government and many New Zealanders. The Government was concerned about the impact that a tour would have on its international relations, in particular participation in the 1982 Commonwealth Games, but also on the domestic front. The police had already started to plan for the possibility of major civil unrest which would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to police and would require the help of the armed forces.<sup>283</sup>

A meeting was eventually held between Muldoon and the Chairman of the NZRFU, Ces Blazey, to discuss the impending Tour. It is unclear what was discussed as afterwards Muldoon and Blazey could not agree upon what had actually been said.<sup>284</sup> It remains unclear as to whether Muldoon specifically told Blazey to cancel the Tour or whether he simply described the impact that it would have upon New Zealand in the hope that Blazey would see sense and cancel it himself.<sup>285</sup> The NZRFU rejected any

---

<sup>280</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>281</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 179.

<sup>282</sup> 'Telegram 620 of 17 September 1980, from Wellington to New Zealand Embassy Peking,' in Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998), 180.

<sup>283</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 181.

<sup>284</sup> *New Zealand Herald*, 6 December 1980, in Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998), 181.

<sup>285</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 181.

appeals to reconsider the invitation with Blazey explaining that the Agreement and apartheid were political matters that the NZRFU was not prepared to get involved with.<sup>286</sup> Blazey later wrote to Talboys stating that “we have neither the knowledge nor the desire to make political decisions. These are a matter for Government.”<sup>287</sup> It appeared as though Blazey was suggesting that the only way that the Tour would be cancelled was if the Government took action to stop the Springboks from entering New Zealand.<sup>288</sup> However, the Government would not be moved from its non-interference policy.

Two weeks prior to the arrival of the Springboks Muldoon made one last appeal to the NZRFU to change its mind.<sup>289</sup> He stated that the Tour was going to be a “disaster” and that he didn’t “think it’s going to do any good for South Africa, for New Zealand, for rugby or anything else ... the Rugby Union is very foolish in going ahead with it.”<sup>290</sup> Muldoon continued that the NZRFU had been briefed by the police and Government about the steps that would need to be taken in order to ensure the Tour went ahead and that individual games, as well as the whole Tour, could be cancelled at any time, in order to maintain law and order.<sup>291</sup> Muldoon concluded that the decision to continue with the Tour would ultimately be left up to the NZRFU and he would not order the Union to cancel.<sup>292</sup> Ramphal was incredibly disappointed to hear that the Tour had not been cancelled. He released a statement in which he said that the Tour would be the most significant sporting contact that a country had had with South Africa since the Agreement was signed.<sup>293</sup> The contact was seen as unacceptable and went against everything that the Agreement stood for. He concluded that the Tour would be seen as a victory for

---

<sup>286</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 182.

<sup>287</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 183.

<sup>288</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 183.

<sup>289</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 366.

<sup>290</sup> ‘Telegram 6175 of 20 June 1981, from NZHC London to Wellington,’ in Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998), 187.

<sup>291</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 366-367.

<sup>292</sup> ‘Prime Minister’s Statement, 6 July 1981, 1,’ in Ron Palenski, *Rugby: A New Zealand history*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015), 367.

<sup>293</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 191.

South Africa as they would be playing their national sport on an international stage for the first time in years.<sup>294</sup>

Anti-apartheid demonstrators believed that Muldoon had failed to meet New Zealand's obligations under the Agreement when he allowed the Tour to proceed.<sup>295</sup> Protest marshal Brent Burnett-Jones thought that Muldoon had no respect or regard for the Agreement. Brent claimed that Muldoon signed it, showing that he was prepared to sever ties with South Africa, however he then went on and "abused it and ignored it as far as he could."<sup>296</sup> Demonstrators believed that much more should have been done to discourage the NZRFU from inviting the Springboks in the first place. Study participant William Anderson felt that Muldoon and the Government could have refused entry or withheld visas as Kirk had done in 1973.<sup>297</sup> William also argued that the Government could have put more pressure on the NZRFU:

The Rugby Union operates within a society, not above it, so certainly much more should've been done to discourage it. The Government could have done anything.<sup>298</sup>

The lead up to the 1981 Tour has been adequately discussed within the existing historiography on the Tour. Templeton gives a detailed analysis of the political landscape prior to the Tour, establishing the position of New Zealand's political parties and discussing Muldoon's non-interference policy. Templeton also discusses the reaction of the international community to the invitation of the NZRFU to the SARB and Muldoon's constant refusal to involve himself in the issue. In particular the reactions of Ramphal and other Commonwealth Heads of Government are discussed with regards to the Agreement and Muldoon's interpretation of it.<sup>299</sup> Likewise, Palenski discusses the lead up to the 1981

---

<sup>294</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 191.

<sup>295</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016; Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016, and William Anderson, [interview with Melissa Morrison], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>296</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>297</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>298</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>299</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 186-188.

Tour with particular emphasis placed on the New Zealand public's opinion of a potential tour.<sup>300</sup> Trevor Richards also describes the lead up to the Tour, but focusses primarily on the anti-apartheid movement in New Zealand. He provides detailed information about the policies which HART implemented and the events which were organised in order to demonstrate opposition to the Tour.<sup>301</sup> Templeton and Palenski are successful at establishing the setting for the Tour by explaining the events and decisions that resulted in the Springboks' arrival in New Zealand on July 22 1981. While Richards discussion of the anti-apartheid movements tactics in the lead up to the Springboks' arrival provides important context for the strategies which HART would implement during the Tour. What happened once the Springboks arrived though, particularly the social aspects of the Tour, still need to be discussed.

It is important to understand what occurred during each of the tours between New Zealand and South Africa from 1919 until 1976, as well as the lead up to 1981, as a number of precedents were set that directly affected the 1981 Tour. It is necessary to understand the history of the relationship in order to comprehend why the events of 1981 occurred. The 1981 Tour did not occur in a vacuum. Rather there was a build-up of issues and precedents in the previous 62 years that impacted on the 1981 Tour. The belief that the issue of sporting contact between New Zealand and South Africa began in 1937 and 1960 due to an increase in public awareness of the exclusion of Māori, is incorrect as precedents that had an impact on the 1981 Tour were set as early as 1919.

---

<sup>300</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 364-366.

<sup>301</sup> Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*, 206-209.

## **Chapter Two: Day One – To oppose or support the Tour?**

This chapter argues that stereotypes cannot be formed with regards to who opposed the Tour and who supported it. The existing secondary literature attempts to assign people to particular positions on the Tour based on their demographics. As a result, myths have been formed as to who the protesters were and why they opposed the Tour. The antithesis of the protesters are then assigned to the pro-Tour position. This chapter challenges the idea that a person's stance on the Tour can be accurately deduced by looking only at their demographics. Rather, a cross-section of New Zealand society both opposed and supported the Tour and their reasons for doing so were not necessarily associated with their demographics.

The first part of this chapter discusses the myths which have been formed by the existing secondary literature. Jock Phillips' 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary article on the Tour explicitly discusses the categories that he formed based on the demographics of Wellington protesters. These categories are centred around age, ethnicity, gender, and geographical location. The demographics of the participants of this study are discussed here in order to establish whether they align with or challenge Phillips' demographic based argument.

The second part of this chapter describes the reasons why the participants of this study who opposed the Tour actually protested. This section argues that rather than demographics, there were specific reasons which influenced the participants of this study. The primary reason for opposing the Tour, as cited by these participants, was South Africa's apartheid policy. There were a number of other reasons which participants cited, such as concern for New Zealand's international reputation and for New Zealand society however, these concerns were secondary in comparison to that of apartheid.

The final section of this chapter discusses the reasons as to why many New Zealanders supported the Tour. Pro-Tour participants identified their enjoyment of watching and playing rugby as the primary reason that they supported the Tour. There were also other, less significant, reasons which influenced many New Zealanders to support the Tour. These reasons included the belief that sports and politics

did not mix and the fact that Tour supporters felt that rugby had been singled out by protesters and the international community. These reasons, though, were secondary to the Tour supporters' enjoyment of rugby, which is ultimately why they wanted the Tour to proceed.

### Protesters and Supporters within the existing historiography

'A Nation of Two Halves,' written by former protester Jock Phillips on the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Springbok Tour, argues that there were a number of specific categories which protesters and supporters of the Tour belonged to, based on their demographics. The sources for the article, and the categories which it discusses, are two surveys which were conducted by Victoria University in Wellington. The first survey was distributed to those protesters who attended the final anti-Tour march in Wellington on the September 12.<sup>302</sup> The second survey was distributed following the Tour to people who were on the mailing list of the Wellington anti-Tour organisation, COST.<sup>303</sup> Of the 1,500 surveys which were distributed, Victoria University received 714 completed questionnaires.<sup>304</sup>

From these surveys Phillips created categories which are based on the age, gender, ethnicity, and geographical location of the Wellington protesters. Phillips has subsequently assigned the antithesis of these categories to the supporters of the Tour. For instance, Phillips states that over half of the anti-Tour protesters, who were surveyed, held a university degree.<sup>305</sup> He believes that this was a result of the 'cultural revolution' which was occurring in New Zealand cities at the time, in that people were becoming more aware of issues of inequality because of higher education.<sup>306</sup> Phillips therefore believes that people in cities were more likely to oppose the Tour because they knew of the issues in

---

<sup>302</sup> Peter King and Jock Phillips, 'A Social Analysis of the Springbok Tour Protesters,' *Counting the Cost: The 1981 Springbok Tour in Wellington*, ed. by David Mackay, Malcolm McKinnon, Peter McPhee and Jock Phillips, (Wellington: Victoria University History Department Occasional Paper, 1982), 3.

<sup>303</sup> King and Phillips, 'A Social Analysis of the Springbok Tour Protesters,' 3.

<sup>304</sup> King and Phillips, 'A Social Analysis of the Springbok Tour Protesters,' 3 and 5.

<sup>305</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 17.

<sup>306</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 19.

South Africa with regards to apartheid. Consequently, he believes that those who lived in more rural and provincial areas, and had less access to higher education, supported the Tour.<sup>307</sup>

According to this article the Tour came down to the 'old' versus 'new' New Zealand. The 'old' New Zealand was comprised of the generation who had lived through war and the Depression and believed that rugby was New Zealand's national religion. They were mostly white men who believed that racial issues did not exist within New Zealand society and they would watch a game of rugby at all costs.<sup>308</sup>

Whereas, those who belonged to the 'new' New Zealand were young and highly educated. Women and Māori were also a part of this group and protested against the Tour because of their own oppression within New Zealand society.<sup>309</sup> Phillips' categories have generalised why people either opposed or supported the Tour based solely on their demographics. This has resulted in the formation of stereotypes and myths about the types of people who protested against or supported the Tour. According to these myths and stereotypes people of a particular gender, age, and ethnicity opposed the Tour, while their counterparts supported it.

One of the issues with Phillips' categories is that they are based solely on the demographics of protesters. The demographics of supporters are simply assumed as being the opposite to those of anti-apartheid demonstrators. It is therefore necessary to discuss each of these categories in relation to the memories and views of the participants of this study, in order to see if there is any correlation between demographics and position on the Tour.

### Age

Within the historiography age was considered relevant when it came to people's position on the Tour. According to Phillips, those who had grown up in the first half of the twentieth century were more likely to support the Tour than those who were born in the 1950s or later.<sup>310</sup> This was a result of what

---

<sup>307</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 17.

<sup>308</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 15.

<sup>309</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 17 and 19.

<sup>310</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 13.

these different generations had experienced and how this affected their perspective on certain issues including the Tour. The survey of Wellington anti-apartheid demonstrators showed that more than two-thirds of those who marched were under 40 years of age, with the majority being between 30 and 34.<sup>311</sup> This generation of New Zealanders, known as the baby boomers, had been brought up in what Phillips' describes as the "prosperous" years of the 1950s.<sup>312</sup> Christine Beardsley describes growing up in Christchurch in the 1950s and 1960s as a time of freedom.

We moved to Papanui when I was about six and that was great [be]cause we lived in a street which backed up onto a railway line, which is a no exit street and so there was hardly any traffic and not a lot of cars in those days. So, us kids, all down the street, we made karts and tree huts, and we played cricket on the street.<sup>313</sup>

This was in contrast to how the previous generation had grown up. The Veteran or 'silent' generation were born between 1925 and 1942, and experienced a number of hardships throughout their lives.<sup>314</sup> Being born between two World Wars and experiencing the Great Depression resulted in a generation who were used to hard work and going without. They were raised in a society that valued tradition and loyalty and as a result believed that things should be done in a certain way.<sup>315</sup> They saw New Zealand's connection to the British Empire as incredibly important and this is why they fought alongside the rest of the Empire in conflicts, such as World War Two and the Vietnam War.<sup>316</sup> Robert Muldoon was the epitome of this generation as he was born in the 1920s and had fought in Vietnam. When making his final appeal to the NZRFU to cancel the Tour, Muldoon even spoke of South Africa and New Zealand fighting together on the battlefield.<sup>317</sup>

---

<sup>311</sup> King and Phillips, 'A Social Analysis of the Springbok Tour Protesters,' 5.

<sup>312</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 13.

<sup>313</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>314</sup> Kristin Lyon, Stephen Legg and Paul Toulson, 'Diversity Management: A generational cohort perspective,' accessed 21 April 2017, [https://www.hrinz.org.nz/Site/Resources/Knowledge\\_Base/A-H/Diversity.aspx](https://www.hrinz.org.nz/Site/Resources/Knowledge_Base/A-H/Diversity.aspx).

<sup>315</sup> Lyon, Legg and Toulson, 'Diversity Management.'

<sup>316</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 15.

<sup>317</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 189.



The split between those who opposed and supported the Tour was not as simple as a generational divide. Peter King and Phillips agree that despite the majority of protesters being baby boomers, the anti-apartheid movement did not belong to just one generation.<sup>318</sup> Rather, New Zealanders of all ages protested against the Tour, likewise those who supported the Tour did not all belong to the Veteran generation. With regards to Phillips' 'old' versus 'new' New Zealand theory, Phillips states that age is discussed in terms of a new generation of politics coming to the fore, rather than a strict age limit.<sup>319</sup> Phillips believes that this new generation, made up of baby boomers, were more politically conscious, as a result of access to higher education and increased urbanisation, than the Veteran generation and were therefore more aware of social injustice.<sup>320</sup> This is why Phillips argues that baby boomers were more likely to protest against the Tour than the Veteran generation. The Veteran generation would not step outside the status quo, they believed in tradition, and that rugby was central to New Zealand culture. By contrast, baby boomers felt freer to question society and protest against injustice.

Phillips' conclusion that the majority of protesters belonged to the younger generations is accurate, however, it must be emphasised that age was not a restriction for either protesting or supporting the Tour. Christine Beardsley recalls seeing all different kinds of people out protesting against the Tour; older people, students, families, and middle-aged adults.<sup>321</sup> It is clear that people of all ages both protested and supported the Tour, therefore, age would not have been the main factor in deciding which side to take. This oral history project only interviewed people who were between the ages of 50 and 65 in 2016, when the interviews were conducted. Therefore, only members of the baby boomer generation were interviewed. However, what the project illustrates is that people of similar ages all had different opinions on the Tour and this was a result, clearly not of their age or generation, but of other factors which influenced their decisions such as their personal values and experiences.

---

<sup>318</sup> King and Phillips, 'A Social Analysis of the Springbok Tour Protesters,' 5.

<sup>319</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 15.

<sup>320</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 15.

<sup>321</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

## Gender

*“There was an underlying cultural revolution within the protest movement, in that young people, church people, Māori, and women linked the protest against apartheid in South Africa with their exclusion from the establishment and the mainstream of New Zealand life. They were victims, they claimed, of a form of social and cultural apartheid.” Spiro Zavos.<sup>322</sup>*

At the time of the Tour there was an underlying ‘cultural revolution’ taking place in New Zealand which caused many New Zealanders, particularly women and Māori, to evaluate their place in mainstream New Zealand society. According to Zavos, this ‘cultural revolution’ was a result of increasing urbanisation following World War Two, as well as an increase in the availability of higher education.<sup>323</sup>

The women’s movement in New Zealand was certainly not new during the 1980s. The second-wave feminist movement began in the 1960s, when women started to question their place within New Zealand society.<sup>324</sup> The women’s liberation movement of the 1970s identified women as an oppressed group and demanded change within society.<sup>325</sup> By the early 1980s, issues which had previously been raised, such as women’s place in both the public and private spheres, were finally being addressed, although with varying degrees of success.<sup>326</sup> Access to higher education for women also enabled them to learn about oppression in regards to race and gender. By 1981 the number of New Zealanders at university had increased from 10,000 in 1956 to over 50,000.<sup>327</sup> While at university students were exposed to a variety of different subjects which helped to broaden their perspective on the world. Students learnt about cultural and racial oppression through the study of colonisation, not just in places such as Australia and South Africa, but in New Zealand as well.

---

<sup>322</sup> Zavos, *Winters of Revenge*, 192.

<sup>323</sup> Zavos, *Winters of Revenge*, 192.

<sup>324</sup> Christine Dann, *Up from Under: Women and liberation in New Zealand 1970-1985*, (Wellington: Allen and Unwin, 1985), 3.

<sup>325</sup> Dann, *Up from Under*, 4-6 and 28.

<sup>326</sup> Dann, *Up from Under*, 45-50.

<sup>327</sup> Phillips, ‘A Nation of Two Halves,’ 17.

These developments meant that women were more aware of, and understood, oppression both in New Zealand and overseas. According to Zavos this 'cultural revolution' helped women connect the oppression in South Africa to the subtler oppression they felt in terms of their exclusion from, and lack of opportunity within, mainstream New Zealand society.<sup>328</sup> The lack of opportunity and equality within the workforce meant that women connected to the plight of the black South African majority as they understood how it felt to be treated as less than equal. Zavos believes that this was one of the reasons as to why women came out in incredibly large numbers to oppose the Tour.<sup>329</sup> However, none of the women that participated in this oral history project cited this as a reason to protest the Tour. Of the seven returned questionnaires from women only one cited the exclusion of women from mainstream New Zealand society as a reason why she opposed the Tour.<sup>330</sup> It appears that feminism was not a key factor that influenced women to protest. Rather, they focussed on the plight of black South Africans and not their own suppression within New Zealand society.

In direct relation to sport, women were also usually relegated to the side-lines, particularly in regards to rugby. Rugby was an extremely male-dominated sport that allowed men to show off their masculine prowess.<sup>331</sup> The only way in which women participated in the sport, at the time, was to provide supper after the game.<sup>332</sup> Women were therefore not only marginalised in the broader sense of mainstream New Zealand society, but they were also side-lined in the gendered culture of rugby. According to feminist activist, Christine Dann, the Tour helped to bring women together against the sexist sport of rugby.<sup>333</sup> Sociologist Shona Thompson agrees that the traditional gender roles, which were associated with rugby, played a key part in why women became involved in the anti-Tour movement.<sup>334</sup> However,

---

<sup>328</sup> Zavos, *Winters of Revenge*, 192.

<sup>329</sup> Zavos, *Winters of Revenge*, 192.

<sup>330</sup> ---, [questionnaire], Palmerston South, 30 August 2016.

<sup>331</sup> Charlotte Hughes, 'Moir's Lament? Feminist advocacy and the 1981 Springbok Tour of New Zealand,' *Tackling Rugby Myths: Rugby and New Zealand society, 1854-2004*, ed. by Greg Ryan, (Dunedin: University of Otago Press, 2005), 140.

<sup>332</sup> Geoff Fougere, 'Sport, Culture and Identity: The case of rugby football,' *Culture and Identity in New Zealand*, ed. by David Novitz and Bill Willmott, (Wellington: GP Books, 1989), 118-119.

<sup>333</sup> Christine Dann, 'The Game is Over,' *Broadsheet*, no. 97, March 1982, 26-27.

<sup>334</sup> Shona Thompson, 'Thank the Ladies for the Plates: The incorporation of women into sport,' *Leisure Studies*, vol. 9, no. 2, 1990, 136.

Dann and Thompson's belief that the Tour resulted in a feminist revolt against rugby, and patriarchy in general, has since been disputed by scholars.<sup>335</sup> Charlotte Hughes argues instead that women, as described by Dann and Thompson, were in the minority of those who protested against the Tour.<sup>336</sup> There were discussions surrounding patriarchy and the gendered culture of rugby however, these reasons were not cited by the majority of women as a reason to protest.<sup>337</sup> In the Victoria University survey, some women did admit to being anti-rugby and that they did not like the "macho aspect" of the game.<sup>338</sup> However, they were not attacking rugby by protesting. Of the 714 survey responses only 12 made negative comments about rugby when asked why they opposed the Tour.<sup>339</sup> Likewise, questionnaire respondents for this oral history project did not cite rugby, and the exclusion of women from the game, as a reason to oppose the Tour.<sup>340</sup> The arguments of Thompson, Dann as well as Phillips, that women protested against the Tour because of their own oppression or because they hated the male sphere of rugby, is incorrect. Hughes believes that these arguments should no longer be accepted as the primary literature on women's involvement in the Tour as feminism and the gendered nature of rugby were not largely discussed by everyday women.<sup>341</sup> Those who did cite these issues as a reason to oppose the Tour seem to be in the minority of protesters, with the majority of women instead focussing on the issue of apartheid.

### Ethnicity

Phillips also identifies New Zealand's own racial issues, at the time, as a reason why Māori opposed the Tour. Phillips states that Māori joined the protest movement, in increasingly large numbers, because they felt that New Zealand had racial issues which needed to be addressed.<sup>342</sup> According to

---

<sup>335</sup> Hughes, 'Moirā's Lament?', 138.

<sup>336</sup> Hughes, 'Moirā's Lament?', 139.

<sup>337</sup> Hughes, 'Moirā's Lament?', 150.

<sup>338</sup> COST Surveys, Wellington Springbok Tour Archive, J.C. Beaglehole Room, Victoria University, Wellington. Surveys are not numbered.

<sup>339</sup> COST Surveys.

<sup>340</sup> ---, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 30 August 2016; Christine Beardsley, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 30 August 2016; Debbie Osborn, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 3 August 2016; Jocelyn Papprell, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 18 July 2016, and Chris Smith, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 15 August 2016.

<sup>341</sup> Hughes, 'Moirā's Lament?', 137 and 141

<sup>342</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves', 19.

Phillips when Māori demonstrated in 1975, during the Land March, to protest their place in New Zealand society, they were not supported by Pakeha New Zealanders.<sup>343</sup> However, when it came to the issue of apartheid in South Africa many of the demonstrators were Pakeha. Some Māori therefore questioned where the rest of New Zealand had been when they had been making a stand for their own rights.<sup>344</sup> Phillips believes that Māori joined the anti-apartheid movement in order to confront Pakeha and to question their own place within mainstream New Zealand society.<sup>345</sup>

Some Pakeha believed that Māori did not require support as there were no overt racial issues which needed to be addressed in New Zealand. The majority of participants stated that New Zealand actually possessed the best race relations in the world at this time.<sup>346</sup> According to Jenny Carlyon and Diana Morrow, the belief in racial harmony was a result of Māori and Pakeha living apart in separate communities throughout the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries.<sup>347</sup> Māori and Pakeha remained relatively isolated from one another due to the fact that the majority of Māori lived in small rural settlements whilst Pakeha lived in more urban areas.<sup>348</sup> This separation meant that very few Pakeha and Māori interacted on a regular basis and as a result Pakeha were able to be complacent about New Zealand's race relations. This complacency resulted in the perpetuation of the New Zealand race relations myth, which was the belief that there were no issues of racial inequality in New Zealand. According to Greg Ryan, New Zealanders also drew comfort from the fact that New Zealand had not resorted to some of the more extreme segregation policies, as had been implemented in Australia and South Africa.<sup>349</sup> Brent Burnett-Jones, who lived in Pakistan for a number of years whilst

---

<sup>343</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 19.

<sup>344</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 19.

<sup>345</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 19.

<sup>346</sup> Brian Hays, [interview with Melissa Morrison], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016; Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016; Tim Hobbs, [interview with Melissa Morrison], Christchurch, 21 September 2016; Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>347</sup> Jenny Carlyon and Diana Morrow, *Changing Times: New Zealand since 1945*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2013), 248.

<sup>348</sup> Michael King, 'Between Two Worlds,' *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, second edition, ed. by Geoffrey W. Rice (Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1992), 285.

<sup>349</sup> Ryan, 'Anthropological Football,' 110.

growing up, remembers coming back to New Zealand and thinking that in comparison to other countries New Zealand's race relations were relatively good.<sup>350</sup>

According to Michael King, following World War Two there was a population shift from rural to urban areas which resulted in racism becoming more pronounced in New Zealand society.<sup>351</sup> Issues of racism had always existed in New Zealand, however, the physical isolation between Māori and Pakeha had helped to perpetuate the myth of racial harmony. Once Māori and Pakeha were interacting with each other more regularly and living in the same areas he argues that discrimination, inequality of opportunities, and institutional racism became more apparent.<sup>352</sup> This was especially true at the time of the Tour, when 78.2 percent of New Zealand's Māori population were living in urban areas.<sup>353</sup> The majority of participants grew up in Christchurch and they described it as a "very white city" at the time of the Tour.

Just from nursing I remember that kind of imbalance, racial imbalance, or cultural imbalance. Christchurch was pretty white and I wasn't really exposed to much. I wasn't really involved with any Māori based affiliations either way, you know, to form opinions whether there was any race based prejudices here or not. **Debbie Osborn.**<sup>354</sup>

I lived in the northwest of Christchurch, predominately white middle class. Yeah there weren't [many] Māori, we didn't come into contact with Māoris. The South Island, generally speaking, if you look at the ethnic breakdown, there's not that many Māoris around. **Tim Hobbs.**<sup>355</sup>

Participants who were living in Christchurch, at the time of the Tour, did not have regular contact with Māori and as a result did not see or experience overt racism. Christchurch appeared to have remained insulated from racial discrimination because there were not large populations of Māori living within

---

<sup>350</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>351</sup> King, 'Between Two Worlds,' 303.

<sup>352</sup> King, 'Between Two Worlds,' 306.

<sup>353</sup> Carlyon and Morrow, *Changing Times*, 248.

<sup>354</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>355</sup> Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016.

the city during the Tour. This contributed to the belief, from some of the participants, that New Zealand did have the best race relations in the world.<sup>356</sup> Those participants who grew up elsewhere had a different view of New Zealand's race relations.

Whanganui is very divided – there's the "Snobs' Rock", we call it, and that's full of white people. When I look back on things now, yeah, we might have been learning a whole lot of things at school or at university, but I wasn't particularly aware of the fact that my friends who were Māori from primary school – they left at the end of the form, they'd gone on to work, they didn't go on to university. One girl during the time when she was at school with us, she told us herself, she said, 'the reason why my skin is this brown, is because I've got Indian ancestry.' **Jocelyn Papprell.**<sup>357</sup>

Jocelyn fully believed that New Zealand's race relations myth was not true as she interacted with Māori on a regular basis and was therefore exposed to discrimination and racism. Likewise, Christine Beardsley witnessed racism despite living in Christchurch. Christine's three adopted siblings were part Māori and she recalls that, at times, racism towards them was quite overt.

One teacher, when one of them started school, just making comments like 'well they won't be able to achieve as well,' just things like that. Then there were things with kids in the playground, you know, horrible words and just horrible put-downs and fights.<sup>358</sup>

Participants' experience of racism in New Zealand, at this time, was therefore affected by where they grew up and lived. Christchurch remained relatively isolated from racial discrimination as a result of the lack of Māori living there.

---

<sup>356</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016; Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016; Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016; Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>357</sup> Jocelyn Papprell, [interview with Melissa Morrison], Christchurch, 28 September 2016.

<sup>358</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

Phillips believes that many Māori identified with the oppression felt by black South Africans as they too felt that they were excluded from mainstream New Zealand society. Racial prejudice existed both in New Zealand and South Africa however, the degree to which this prejudice existed was dramatically different in each country.<sup>359</sup> In South Africa, black and coloured South Africans had effectively no rights. In comparison, racial issues and oppression in New Zealand appeared minute. Unlike their South African counterparts, Māori were able to vote, live where they wanted, and were effectively equal in every way to Pakeha New Zealanders.<sup>360</sup> Despite this equality, racism still existed in New Zealand society particularly in regards to the exclusion of Māori from mainstream New Zealand society.

Māori culture, heritage, and history were underrepresented within mainstream New Zealand society. According to Michael King, when Māori moved from rural to urban areas, and thus came into more frequent contact with Pakeha, they were expected to assimilate and learn Pakeha culture.<sup>361</sup> It would appear, however, that there was no pressure for Pakeha to learn about Māori culture or history.<sup>362</sup> While at school Tim Hobbs remembers doing Māori arts and crafts however, he was not able to learn Te reo Māori as this was not taught in schools.<sup>363</sup> Other participants, who grew up in Christchurch, could not recall learning much about Māori culture. Christine Beardsley remembers reading books about Māori, but that they were very antiquated and depicted Māori girls wearing grass skirts.<sup>364</sup> This was a very different learning experience from those who were schooled elsewhere. Leon Eccersall, who spent a few years in Wellington, recalled spending time on a Marae where he learnt about Māori culture.<sup>365</sup> The Treaty of Waitangi (the Treaty) was also a facet of Māori and Pakeha history that appeared to be glossed over in schools. A number of participants did not learn about the Treaty in

---

<sup>359</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 10.

<sup>360</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 10.

<sup>361</sup> King, 'Between Two Worlds,' 306.

<sup>362</sup> King, 'Between Two Worlds,' 306.

<sup>363</sup> Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016.

<sup>364</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>365</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.



school and only learnt about it later in life.<sup>366</sup> Chris Smith, who grew up on the West Coast of the South Island, was taught about the Treaty, but it was discussed only as a historical document, rather than an agreement that still had meaning and value within New Zealand society.<sup>367</sup>

Study participant Kevin Taylor, who identifies as Māori, certainly felt that his culture and heritage were not a part of mainstream New Zealand society due to the lack of knowledge and understanding that many people had of Māori history.<sup>368</sup> Kevin remembers that there were no classes on Māori history and apart from kapa haka lessons Māori culture was not taught at school.

I can remember when, we may have been doing the industrial revolution in England in the 1800s or whatever, and we'd been through everybody else's history coming into this and I am sitting there thinking, you know, what the hell am I learning about industrial revolution for in England. I said to my social studies teacher at the time, why can't we learn about some Māori history, she said, you should be able to pick that up from home, so that was that. So, for my five years at secondary school, except for kapa haka, there was no Māori lessons or history or anything in those five years, even coming through intermediate and primary school, but doing kapa haka which might have been once a year. So, there was no Māori taught.<sup>369</sup>

The lack of understanding and knowledge of Māori history and culture, as a result of its omission from the school curriculum, may have contributed to New Zealanders not being aware that there were racial issues within New Zealand society. According to Phillips, those who belonged to the 'old' New Zealand, the war veterans and farmers, believed prior to the Tour, that New Zealand had no racial issues. They believed that any problems which arose as a result of colonisation had been resolved with the introduction of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975. However, those who belonged to the 'new' New

---

<sup>366</sup> Brian Hays learnt about the Treaty when he began teaching, Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Christine Beardsley learnt about the Treaty just prior to the Tour, Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016, and Leon Eccersall attended a multi-cultural school in Wellington and learnt about the Treaty there, Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>367</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>368</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>369</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

Zealand, the baby boomers and those who received higher educations, knew that this was not true.<sup>370</sup>

They realised that there were still issues which had yet to be addressed and Phillips believes that they therefore protested about these issues.

Not only did some Māori protest against their exclusion from mainstream New Zealand society in terms of culture and education, some Māori also protested against the dominant discourse of 'rugby, racing and beer,' which was inextricably linked to Pakeha identity.<sup>371</sup> Even though a number of first-class New Zealand rugby players were Māori and their contribution to the game was outstanding, the discourse surrounding rugby remained predominantly white. This was especially prevalent after the 1970 tour to South Africa where Māori players were referred to as 'honorary whites.' It is therefore not surprising that Māori were offended by their lack of true representation within rugby culture and wanted recognition for their contribution. Inequality, institutional racism, and the lack of recognition on the rugby field was linked by some Māori to the oppression felt by black South Africans.<sup>372</sup> This connection caused some Māori to protest against the Tour on behalf of those in South Africa, as well as for the oppression they felt within mainstream New Zealand society.<sup>373</sup> Māori had become more conscious of this oppression during the 1970s in, what has been called, the Māori renaissance.<sup>374</sup> It was during this period that Māori began to reassert control over their culture and realise that they were not being treated fairly.<sup>375</sup> Māori began to demand recognition and respect from Pakeha, the Government, and wider New Zealand society. The Māori renaissance movement was a result of the increasing urbanisation of Māori, who were able to see their oppression and marginalised status once

---

<sup>370</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 15 and 19.

<sup>371</sup> Lucy Arthur, 'Rugby, Racism and Fear: The reaction of Invercargill People to the 1981 Springbok tour of New Zealand,' (University of Otago: Honours Dissertation, 1998), 12.

<sup>372</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 19.

<sup>373</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 19.

<sup>374</sup> Angela Ballara, *Proud to be White? A survey of Pakeha prejudice in New Zealand*, (Auckland: Heinemann, 1986), 163.

<sup>375</sup> Ballara, *Proud to be White?*, 163.

in close contact with Pakeha.<sup>376</sup> This renaissance led to an increase in activism from Māori who took to the streets to demand fair treatment in all aspects of life.

The Land March of 1975 is one of the most famous protests by Māori. Whina Cooper, a leading figure in Māori affairs, led the Land March to protest the taking of land by the Crown from Māori.<sup>377</sup> This march was followed by occupations of Bastion Point in 1978 and Raglan in 1979 in order to show their determination to have their grievances heard and recognised.<sup>378</sup> The Māori renaissance movement gave Māori the confidence to speak out against their marginalisation in New Zealand society and thus when it came to the 1981 Springbok Tour they were in a position where they could sympathise with black South Africans under the apartheid regime. However, not all Māori would have sympathised or identified with black South Africans. Many Māori did in fact attend a number of the games during the Tour because they wanted to watch rugby and support their local teams.<sup>379</sup>

I went to three games; the Otago game down in Dunedin on the Tuesday, the first test over here at Christchurch and the Māori game in Napier. When I went to Napier for the Māori game there I've never seen so many Māori at a rugby game and I can back that up because I went to just about all [of] the Shield games in the late 60's when Hawkes Bay had the Shield. No protesters in sight, I can't remember any protesters at night walking the streets or during the game, after the game. I don't think there [were] any of the big containers like there were over here in Christchurch. Whether that was because it was a provincial town, they just weren't visible. I think the Māori game was about half way through the Tour or maybe just over half way through so things hadn't really started to ramp up by then. My impression is that because it was a Māori game there was no protesters in sight and whether they knew better to go

---

<sup>376</sup> Augie Fleras and Paul Spoonley, *Recalling Aotearoa: Indigenous politics and ethnic relations in New Zealand*, (Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1999), 44.

<sup>377</sup> King, *The Penguin History of New Zealand*, 479-480.

<sup>378</sup> Fleras and Spoonley, *Recalling Aotearoa*, 44.

<sup>379</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

there or to stay away because there was so many Māori there and it could [have] got quite confrontational. **Kevin Taylor.**<sup>380</sup>

Despite being Māori himself and feeling that his own culture was, at times, excluded from mainstream New Zealand society Kevin did not identify with the plight of black South Africans.<sup>381</sup> Kevin understood what was happening in South Africa and knew that the policy of apartheid was morally wrong, however, he was more concerned with the position of Māori in New Zealand. Kevin wanted New Zealand to fix its own issues before New Zealanders started telling other countries how to fix their problems.<sup>382</sup> Kevin therefore supported the Tour, contradicting the belief of Phillips that Māori opposed the Tour because of racial issues in New Zealand. Kevin believed that New Zealand needed to sort out its own issues in regards to race, before it could comment on the racial discrimination in other countries.<sup>383</sup>

That was my one of my main views on supporting the Tour – clean up your own backyard first before you tell somebody else how to clean their yard up. So that was my whole, I suppose, philosophy. That was a big part of me supporting the Tour, along with the rugby. So that was my political statement I suppose.<sup>384</sup>

Kevin felt that it was wrong for New Zealanders to comment on the issues in another country when New Zealand's own race relations problem still existed. Kevin's belief was echoed by a student in Christchurch, who wrote shortly after the Tour that, "I do not think it is altogether prudent to comment on another country's political or social difficulties until you are quite sure that your own country is free from such blemishes."<sup>385</sup> Kevin did not oppose the Tour because of his own oppression

---

<sup>380</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>381</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>382</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>383</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>384</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>385</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 17-113467,' Springbok Rugby Tour Papers, University of Canterbury, 1981, accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

and exclusion from New Zealand society; instead he supported it in order to show that he was unhappy with the treatment of Māori in New Zealand.

It is difficult to make any steadfast conclusions in regards to why Māori protested against or supported the Tour. This is a result of the lack of Māori participants in this study. Generalisations cannot be made from one person's reasoning to support the Tour. However, Kevin's reason for supporting the Tour illustrates that some Māori showed their upset and anger at being excluded from mainstream New Zealand society in different ways. Some people protested, as is shown by Phillips' survey of members of Wellington's COST, whilst some people vented their anger at the lack of understanding and equality by supporting the Tour. However, it is important note that there was no singular Māori position, just as there was no one Pakeha position. Not all Māori would have felt excluded from mainstream New Zealand society and therefore would not have either supporter or opposed the Tour in order to show their upset or anger. Rather, some Māori may have supported the Tour simply because they enjoyed watching rugby, whilst others may have protested against the Tour because they considered the apartheid policy in South Africa to be abhorrent.

#### Urban versus rural thinking

Phillips and Zavos have also generalised that the majority of support for the Tour came from the rural areas, whereas anti-apartheid sentiment was stronger in the cities. Zavos believes that this was due to the 'urban cultural revolution,' where people in cities were higher educated and exposed to international thinking and perspectives unlike their rural counterparts.<sup>386</sup> This meant that people in cities knew more about the plight of black South Africans under apartheid because they had learnt about it through university as well as through cultural activities, such as film festivals and plays. According to the Victoria University survey more than half of the anti-apartheid demonstrators, that were surveyed, had a university degree.<sup>387</sup> Thus they were aware of issues in South Africa having learnt

---

<sup>386</sup> Zavos, in Arthur, 'Rugby, Racism and Fear,' 12.

<sup>387</sup> Phillips, 'A Nation of Two Halves,' 17.

about them at university. In comparison, those in rural and provincial areas were more isolated from the outside world and therefore may not have known about or fully understood the situation in South Africa.

Over half of the participants, of this study, agreed with Phillips and Zavos' generalisation that support for the Tour came primarily from rural and provincial areas.<sup>388</sup>

Well, I think, generally speaking, rural areas tend to vote National, tend to be more right-wing and therefore more conservative. I think yes, the liberal, left-wing was mostly in the cities.

**Tim Hobbs.**<sup>389</sup>

Yeah I'd agree with you there [be]cause I think with the smaller provincial areas you've got a closer relationship with the teams. You know the players anyway, you grew up with a lot of them. Marlborough at the time went through a really passionate stage of having taken the Ranfurly Shield and there was such an intensity there and you were part of it. You went to the parades, you went to the pub later on, you drank with these guys, you socialised with them, you supported them, and hence I think there was a far greater, say, country support as opposed to, like you said, the city one where they didn't have that contact with the players.

**Leon Eccersall.**<sup>390</sup>

It can therefore be ascertained that in rural and provincial areas rugby held a much stronger place within the community and thus there would be greater support for the Tour in these areas. Other participants though, believed that location may not have had such a bearing on reaction to the Tour. Christine Beardsley recalls that there was widespread support for the Tour in the cities. She remembers that there were, "some very vociferous pro-Tour people in Christchurch at the time

---

<sup>388</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016; Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016; Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016; Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016; Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016; Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>389</sup> Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016.

<sup>390</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

too.”<sup>391</sup> Christine also agrees with Phillips though, that cities provide a place in which different ideas can foster and develop:

I guess what you have in a city, which is what I love about cities, is that big population and a whole range of different ideas and different people and so, you know, you can engage with people, and sort of expand your own ideas. I think it would’ve been, you know I was 31, I think, in 1981 and I would’ve been more frightened if I’d been in a small provincial town or a little sort of village-y place with my views, but because there were other people that believed the same thing, I think it kind of fortified you actually. It was great and, of course, you could develop the ideas and explore them in a group of people who want to talk about it too.<sup>392</sup>

Therefore, the belief that people living in urban environments knew more about the issues in comparison to people in rural areas, does have some merit. Participants, however, believed that location was not the main factor which influenced people’s stance on the Tour. This is particularly pertinent as all of the participants were living in the city of Christchurch during the Tour and yet their position on the Tour varied. Instead of geographical location, there were other factors that influenced the participants’ position on the Tour.

The demographics of New Zealanders with regards to their age, ethnicity, gender, and geographical location did not influence the position on the Tour for this study’s participants. Rather, participants believe that protesters and those who were members of HART in Christchurch came from a vast cross-section of New Zealand society.<sup>393</sup> Protester Christine Beardsley believes that men and women, young and old, and people from all different backgrounds came together to protest against the Tour.<sup>394</sup> According to prominent protester, Trevor Richards, the age of HART members ranged from 17 to 70

---

<sup>391</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>392</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>393</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016; Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016; Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016; Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016; Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016; Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016, and Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>394</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

and included people from different occupations, faiths, and political beliefs.<sup>395</sup> It was their opposition to apartheid and social injustice which brought them together in 1981.<sup>396</sup> Likewise, a myriad of different people supported the Tour for various reasons, although primarily for their love of rugby. For the participants of this study there was no correlation between demographics and position on the Tour. Instead participants cited their beliefs in social justice and their love of rugby as the reasons why they chose to either oppose or support the Tour. This does not necessarily mean that Phillips' categories, which are based solely on demographics, are incorrect or invalid. King and Phillips acknowledge that their study is based on protesters in Wellington and that they are not necessarily representative of every New Zealander who protested against the Tour.<sup>397</sup> King and Phillips believe that the Wellington anti-apartheid movement was in fact incredibly unique in that it was one of the most organised, unified, and disciplined movements in New Zealand.<sup>398</sup> The demographics of the people of Wellington must also be taken into consideration as this skews the survey's sample. Wellington's demography at the time trended toward professionals with higher incomes who had no children. Thus Phillips' assessment of protesters, for instance, having a higher education as opposed to Tour supporters is a result of the location where the survey was conducted. The categories which have been established by Phillips are therefore valid when discussing demonstrators in Wellington. However, when looking at other cities and towns throughout New Zealand it is necessary to understand the motivations and experiences of people in each of those places, in order to accurately conclude why they either protested or supported the Tour. In regards to Christchurch, protesters did not fit into the categories which Phillips created, rather they cited apartheid as the primary reason why they protested against the Tour and believed that demographics did not factor into their decisions on what stance to take on the issue. Similarly, for those who supported the Tour in Christchurch, they cited their enjoyment of watching rugby as the motivating factor for supporting the Tour rather, than

---

<sup>395</sup> Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*, 129.

<sup>396</sup> Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*, 129.

<sup>397</sup> King and Phillips, 'A Social Analysis of the Springbok Tour Protesters,' 4.

<sup>398</sup> King and Phillips, 'A Social Analysis of the Springbok Tour Protesters,' 4.



their demographics. The reasons why people in Christchurch, who participated in this study, either opposed or supported the Tour are discussed below.

### Why New Zealanders opposed the Tour?

There were a number of reasons, as identified by this study's participants, why New Zealanders opposed the Tour. The primary reason, which the participants' cited, was that South Africa's apartheid policy was morally abhorrent. The treatment of black and coloured South Africans by the white South African minority was viewed as racial segregation at its most extreme by participants. This segregation and oppression of the black majority is why all participants who identified as anti-Tour, did not want the Springboks to play rugby in New Zealand in 1981. There were also a number of secondary reasons which participants cited as factors which propelled them to oppose the Tour. These included the effect that the Tour would have on New Zealand's international reputation, other sporting codes, and the potential harmful impact that it would have on New Zealand society with regards to the civil unrest and protests that could occur if it went ahead.

### Apartheid

It was a system that crushed people, that didn't give them [an] opportunity, that was actually cruel. [It] [was] definitely morally wrong and it did need to go. [It] needed to change. **Christine Beardsley on the South African policy of apartheid.**<sup>399</sup>

South Africa's policy of apartheid has been cited by scholars, demonstrators, and the anti-Tour movement as the primary reason that the Tour was opposed by so many New Zealanders. According to historian Jacob Pollock demonstrators focussed on the political system of apartheid in South Africa because the regime promoted the segregation and oppression of the black South African majority.<sup>400</sup> Black South Africans had very few rights due to the policy of apartheid; they could not vote, ownership of land was severely restricted, and black and coloured South Africans could not use the same public

---

<sup>399</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>400</sup> Jacob Pollock, 'We Don't Want Your Racist Tour: The 1981 Springbok Tour and the anxiety of settlement in Aotearoa/New Zealand,' *Graduate Journal of Asia-Pacific Studies*, volume 2, no. 1, 2004, 32.

facilities as white South Africans.<sup>401</sup> New Zealanders who protested against the Tour did so primarily because of this racial policy. The following excerpts from the interviews describe how participants viewed apartheid:

Basically, I just thought it was wrong. I mean again we're looking back, you know, New Zealand as far as I was aware had this beautiful system and suddenly we're dealing with something where it's totally based on race and that just didn't seem right to me. **Brent Burnett-Jones.**<sup>402</sup>

I thought it was totally wrong. How can one lot of people be better than another lot of people. How can you say to one lot of people you can't use that water, you can't go to those toilets, you have to sit in this certain place in the bus. That is so wrong and it used to make me really cross because I was brought up that everybody was equal and you should treat other people as you would like to be treated. I couldn't believe it. I couldn't believe how you could say that these white people are somehow bigger, brighter, and better than people who aren't. What makes having a particular colour of skin a lesser person than another person who doesn't share your colour, not right. **Chris Smith.**<sup>403</sup>

I honestly thought it was appalling – I couldn't believe that someone would treat others like that. But then you also compared it to the States and black civil rights there, and then what happened with the Indian Independence Movement. This has happened in societies, and it happened in New Zealand. **Jocelyn Papprell.**<sup>404</sup>

It is clear that participants thought that apartheid was wrong because of how black and coloured South Africans were treated under the policy. Participants could not understand how these people could be treated so poorly by another group and that this was condoned, even promoted, within South Africa. There was a consensus amongst the participants that apartheid was 'morally wrong' and that it

---

<sup>401</sup> Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*, 13 and 24.

<sup>402</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>403</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>404</sup> Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016.

needed to be abolished.<sup>405</sup> It was hoped that protesting against rugby contact with South Africa, and apartheid in general, during the Tour, it would help to bring about the end of apartheid.<sup>406</sup>

The policy of apartheid was relatively well known about in New Zealand before the Tour as a result of media coverage, previous Springbok tours, and the New Zealand school curriculum. Debbie Osborn and Brent Burnett-Jones were both involved in previous protest movements regarding sporting contact with South Africa, during the 1970s. Debbie recalls being on the periphery of the campaign against the 1976 All Black tour to South Africa.<sup>407</sup>

You would talk about it at high school and so I became aware of the inequalities and also my ex-sister-in-law was [a] white South African and so she obviously did influence me a bit. She's obviously very anti-racist. So probably they're the sort of things that influenced me in the beginning and then that made me read newspaper articles more and hear things on the radio, rather than just letting them brush past me.<sup>408</sup>

Debbie became more informed and as a result began to question how black and coloured South Africans could be treated so differently to white South Africans. Debbie found it difficult to comprehend how the minority could control the majority through violence and oppression, and how this oppression could permeate all facets of society.<sup>409</sup> For Debbie, apartheid went against everything that she knew to be right; it was morally and culturally wrong.<sup>410</sup> Brent recalls marching along Colombo Street in Christchurch, with several hundred people, in 1979 to protest against the possibility of a

---

<sup>405</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016; Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016; Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016; Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016; Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016; Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016; Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016; Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016; Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>406</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016; Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016; Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016; Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016; Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016, and Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>407</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>408</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>409</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>410</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

future Springbok tour in New Zealand.<sup>411</sup> Brent describes his motivation to protest as “fairly simple,” in that he thought apartheid was “totally wrong and offensive and for New Zealand to be seen as complicit in [it] was demeaning to our country.”<sup>412</sup> Other participants had primarily heard about apartheid at school as it was a part of the New Zealand school curriculum. According to William Anderson, who opposed the Tour because of his hatred of apartheid, every New Zealander should have been aware of the racial segregation in South Africa because it was taught in schools.<sup>413</sup> This meant that ignorance of the issues in South Africa could not have been used as an excuse to not oppose apartheid or the Tour. William believes that every New Zealander should have opposed apartheid because they knew exactly what was happening in South Africa and therefore should not have supported an event, such as the Tour, which appeared to condone the racist policy.<sup>414</sup>

The upbringing of participants also had a profound impact on their stance on the Tour. Both Jocelyn Papprell and Christine Beardsley learnt about apartheid from their teachers and parents by discussing the injustices which were occurring in South Africa, and elsewhere in the world. These conversations not only taught them about apartheid, but also helped them to form morals and values that would influence their decisions in later life. Jocelyn’s social studies teacher was vehemently opposed to apartheid, and his views helped Jocelyn to question what was happening in South Africa and what she could do to help those who were being oppressed.

Mr Greenwood, Social Studies teacher in 1974. But before that, I probably had some inkling, because you couldn't help but see some things on the television or hear some things from my older brother, who was teaching History at that stage as well. But it was really brought home by Mr Bill Greenwood, in 1974. He was the one who, when the South African softball team visited Whanganui, for some strange reason in 1976 or whenever that was, and [we went] with him [to] protest, there must have been a handful of us there. Probably Whanganui

---

<sup>411</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>412</sup> Brent Burnett-Jones, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 22 August 2016.

<sup>413</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>414</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

thought that was pretty weird. But he was a softly spoken man who really believed in social justice issues. That's what he brought home to us about apartheid. You've got books in a library and everything about it as well. There's a lot of crap put up by the regime that was sent to all school libraries. He countered it with what reality was, [because] he had information from ANC, Steve Biko, and songs and all sorts of things – just a wide variety of media that he brought home to help us understand what was going on there.<sup>415</sup>

Mr Greenwood had a significant impact on Jocelyn, in that she has spent her life fighting for social justice and equality. It was his influence and teaching that made Jocelyn aware of what was happening in South Africa and inspired her to protest against apartheid. Likewise, Christine was influenced by her parents who spoke openly about human rights issues around the world.

That came from my parents [because] we would have family conversations round the table about politics and why did this happen and how did it happen and why do some people support it. I mean it was an intriguing kind of topic to be talking about, you know, the idea that white policemen could shoot a black person and they wouldn't be put in front of a court. I was staggered at that.<sup>416</sup>

These discussions helped to open Christine's eyes to how people were treated elsewhere and the injustices which occurred. Christine's upbringing and the influence of her parents therefore had a profound impact on how she approached the Tour issue. Her parents helped to shape her values and morals with regards to equality and justice and thus, when it came to the Tour and apartheid Christine knew that it went against everything she believed in.

This knowledge of the apartheid regime, either gathered as a result of previous tours or from teachers and parents, helped participants to fully understand how black and coloured South Africans were treated. It was this awareness that stirred many New Zealanders to fight against apartheid.

---

<sup>415</sup> Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016.

<sup>416</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

Participants understood the oppression and lack of rights that the majority of South Africans endured on a daily basis and realised that apartheid went against all principles of social justice, as they had been taught by teachers and parents. Apartheid was morally and culturally wrong and this is the primary reason as to why many New Zealanders, and in particular the participants of this study, protested against it and the Tour.

#### Secondary concerns for anti-apartheid demonstrators

There were a number of other reasons why many New Zealanders protested against the Tour, however according to the participants of this study these reasons were secondary, with apartheid remaining the primary reason to oppose the Tour. One of these secondary concerns was that, if the Tour went ahead, New Zealand could be seen as a country that condoned and endorsed apartheid. All of the participants who opposed the Tour identified this as one of the reasons why they protested.<sup>417</sup> Participants believed that by continuing sporting contacts with South Africa, New Zealand was encouraging and supporting the policy of apartheid.<sup>418</sup> One anti-apartheid demonstrator, writing shortly after the Tour, stated that those who opposed the Tour did so in order to “vehemently disassociate [them]selves from any appearance of collaboration with the white South African dictatorship.”<sup>419</sup> It is clear that many New Zealanders believed that hosting the Springboks would be seen as an endorsement of apartheid and that the South African policy would be practiced in New Zealand during the Tour.

---

<sup>417</sup> Burnett-Jones, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 22 August 2016; Beardsley, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 30 August 2016; Smith, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 15 August 2016; Osborn, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 3 August 2016; Papprell, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 18 July 2016, and William Anderson, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 29 August 2016.

<sup>418</sup> Anderson, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 29 August 2016; Beardsley, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 30 August 2016; Burnett-Jones, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 22 August 2016; Osborn, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 3 August 2016; Papprell, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 18 July 2016, and Smith, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 15 August 2016.

<sup>419</sup> ‘Springbok Tour Archive no. 70-113558,’ Springbok Rugby Tour Papers, University of Canterbury, 1981, accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

If the Tour meant that New Zealand would be seen to condone apartheid then New Zealand's international reputation could be damaged if the Tour proceeded. The risk to New Zealand's reputation was a contributing factor as to why many New Zealanders opposed the Tour. New Zealand had previously been criticised on the international stage for allowing sporting contact to continue. Commonwealth Secretary General, Shridath Ramphal, explicitly stated on a number of occasions, that those who continued to be involved in sport with South Africa gave the appearance that they supported and condoned apartheid.<sup>420</sup> A Christchurch woman, writing after the Tour, explained that she opposed the Tour because she was afraid of how the rest of the world would judge New Zealand if it went ahead. She wrote that, "I got concerned that the rest of the world would see us as racists."<sup>421</sup> She did believe that people should have the freedom to play sport against whomever they wished however, she believed that New Zealand's international reputation was more important than a game of rugby.<sup>422</sup> Christine Beardsley and Debbie Osborn believe that the actions of protesters during the Tour actually helped to save New Zealand's international reputation:<sup>423</sup>

I felt [that] protesting against the Tour, because it was a connection to a country that had apartheid as their political system, I just thought no this is a good thing. It's a good thing for New Zealand to stand up and say we don't support this. **Christine Beardsley.**<sup>424</sup>

I think if we'd been complacent and [sat] back and let things happen then that's condoning the way other countries, you know, their bad habits and so I think that if we hadn't done anything, I don't think that would've achieved anything. I think we had to do something.

**Debbie Osborn.**<sup>425</sup>

---

<sup>420</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 179-180.

<sup>421</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 69-113557,' Springbok Rugby Tour Papers, University of Canterbury, 1981, accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

<sup>422</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 69-113557.'

<sup>423</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016, and Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>424</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>425</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

Ensuring that New Zealand's international reputation was not damaged by the Tour was not a primary motivating factor for the majority of anti-apartheid demonstrators. Again, the issue went back to apartheid and the racial segregation that it promoted. William Anderson was not even concerned with how the rest of the world saw New Zealand, instead he concentrated primarily on the issue of apartheid.<sup>426</sup>

There was also concern that if the Tour went ahead other sports teams and athletes would be adversely affected. Sports boycotts of New Zealand had been threatened previously in the lead up to the 1976 Olympics and the 1978 Commonwealth Games. These threats were a result of continued sporting contact between New Zealand and South Africa. In 1976 Abraham Ordia, President of the SCSA, attempted to have New Zealand expelled from the Montreal Olympics.<sup>427</sup> However, Lance Cross, the New Zealand representative on the International Olympic Committee (IOC), convinced the IOC that rugby was not connected to the Olympic team and therefore they should not be punished.<sup>428</sup> The IOC agreed however, African, Asian, and Caribbean countries decided to boycott the Montreal Olympics.<sup>429</sup> Likewise in the lead up to the 1978 Commonwealth Games a number of African, Asian, and Caribbean countries threatened to withdraw their teams if the New Zealand Government did not take action to prevent contact with South Africa. Only Nigeria followed through with this threat and boycotted these Games.<sup>430</sup> The threat of boycotts or exclusion from future sporting tournaments caused concern for some New Zealanders, including William.

Some of our sporting teams were already having some barriers put up on their participation because of our proposed visit from [the] South African rugby side that was set for the year

---

<sup>426</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>427</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 346.

<sup>428</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 128.

<sup>429</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 129.

<sup>430</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 163-164.



after 1980. So, it went well outside rugby in that it did impact on other sports, definitely. It was plainly unfair to the athletes themselves that they [were] being impacted.<sup>431</sup>

This was one of the reasons that William became involved with the anti-apartheid movement. However, for William the impact of the Tour on other sports and athletes was a secondary issue. Sports boycotts did put up barriers for some New Zealand athletes, however the primary issue for William was still the policy of apartheid.

The major issue, again it came back to the moral argument. The morality and legitimacy of the South Africa[n] regime was the main issue. The secondary issue, or a relatively minor issue compared to that, was the impact on other New Zealand sports people.<sup>432</sup>

Furthermore, there was concern and fear from some New Zealanders regarding the potential impact of the Tour on New Zealand society. Mass protests and civil unrest had been threatened by anti-apartheid organisations in the lead up to the 1973 Springbok tour before it was cancelled and there were fears that if the 1981 Tour went ahead there would be violence and protests on an unprecedented scale.<sup>433</sup> These concerns had some merit, as precedents for violence and mass civil unrest had been established during the Springbok tour of Australia in 1971, when confrontations between protesters and police escalated.<sup>434</sup> The New Zealand Police had been planning, for some time, as to how something similar would be dealt with in New Zealand. It was estimated that policing the Tour would cost between \$1.5 and \$2.7 million and that the army would be required to help maintain law and order.<sup>435</sup> There were also no guarantees that the Tour would be able to proceed even if there were adequate police resources.<sup>436</sup> Fears of civil unrest were further exacerbated when anti-apartheid organisations announced that they would go to the very “edge of the law” to stop the

---

<sup>431</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>432</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>433</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 363.

<sup>434</sup> MacDonald, *The Game of Our Lives*, 93.

<sup>435</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 181.

<sup>436</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 181.

Tour.<sup>437</sup> One Christchurch-based Police Officer, writing after the Tour, stated that a number of police supported the Tour however, there were some officers who were concerned with how it would affect New Zealand. He wrote, “there were definitely some who considered [that] the Tour shouldn’t go ahead, many not because they were anti-Tour but because of the disruption which would occur.”<sup>438</sup> He was also worried that the political and social ramifications would affect New Zealand for some time after the Tour.<sup>439</sup> It was clear that some New Zealanders were afraid of how the Tour would affect New Zealand society, and as a result did not want it to happen. Some of these fears would be realised once the Springboks arrived in New Zealand when civil unrest and acts of violence did occur.



Figure 2. Photograph taken by Kapil Arn which shows that protesters came from a large cross-section of New Zealand society.

[Source: Kapil Arn, in Tom Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire: A response to the 1981 Springbok Tour of New Zealand*, (Auckland: Real Pictures, 1981), 4.]

<sup>437</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 191.

<sup>438</sup> ‘Springbok Tour Archive no. 32(I)-113483,’ Springbok Rugby Tour Papers, University of Canterbury, 1981, accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

<sup>439</sup> ‘Springbok Tour Archive no. 32(I)-113483.’

Nevertheless, the primary reason, as identified by participants, for opposing the Tour was South Africa's apartheid policy, with participants protesting against the segregation and treatment that black and coloured South Africans endured. There were a number of other reasons that motivated many New Zealanders to protest against the Tour, however these issues were minor in comparison to that of apartheid. It is clear that participants who opposed the Tour did not choose their stance on the Tour as a result of their demographics, but rather their upbringing and moral values stirred them to protest against the Tour and apartheid.

### Why did New Zealanders support the Tour?

The primary reason for supporting the Tour, as identified by this study's participants, was due to the fact that they enjoyed watching rugby. Rugby held a significant place in New Zealand society at the time of the Tour; it was seen as the 'national religion' and the national pastime. As a result of its prominent place within New Zealand society many New Zealanders supported the Tour simply because they were rugby fans. There were a number of other reasons as to why some participants supported the Tour, including the belief that sports and politics did not mix, as well as the feeling that rugby, and New Zealand, were being singled out by anti-apartheid groups and the international community. These reasons though were secondary in comparison to the participant's desire to watch the All Blacks take on the Springboks.

### For the enjoyment of the game

So why did I support the Tour? It was just all down to [the] simple basics of loving sport, loving the game of rugby. I wanted to see it go ahead, I wanted [it] to come into the small provincial areas to boost it up, to heighten the awareness of sport. These guys, they're as good as the professional athletes these days, they were tough people, very skilled, very gifted, and they just want to showcase their skills and a lot of people wanted to watch that. That's where it came from for me, I wanted to see good quality rugby. **Leon Eccersall**.<sup>440</sup>

---

<sup>440</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

For many New Zealanders, the primary reason that they supported the Tour was because they thoroughly enjoyed both watching and playing rugby. There was a consensus amongst this study's participants, who identified as pro-Tour, that they supported the Tour because they enjoyed the game of rugby and therefore wanted the Tour to proceed so that they could watch their favourite sport.<sup>441</sup>

Brian Hays, who has been actively involved within the rugby community for a number of years, both locally in Christchurch and nationally, explained that sport was incredibly important to him which is why he supported the Tour: "it's about sport and sport was my religion and sport probably still is my religion."<sup>442</sup> Rugby was seen as New Zealand's 'national religion' at the time of the Tour for a number of reasons. The game was incredibly important to many New Zealanders as it created unity and feelings of national pride when the All Blacks performed well on the rugby field.

Rugby was a game that brought people together as watching the All Blacks was seen as a national pastime. Watching test matches on television or listening to them via the radio was very much seen as a family affair.<sup>443</sup> Former Police Constable Leon Eccersall recalled sitting in the lounge watching the games with his father. They made "a point of getting up and watching the matches that were [in the] early hours."<sup>444</sup> While Kevin Taylor remembers that watching the games was very family orientated, stating that it was "a thing to do as a family with my dad."<sup>445</sup> The watching of rugby together as a family was one reason as to why rugby was not just a game to some New Zealanders. It was something that helped to establish bonds between fathers and sons, in this way it was a game about family.

Rugby also helped to create a feeling of national pride for many New Zealanders. It was a game that New Zealand was good at, both at home and abroad. The prowess of the All Blacks was known and respected throughout the world. In 1905 the 'Originals,' the first fully representative New Zealand

---

<sup>441</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016; Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016; Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>442</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>443</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016, and Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>444</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>445</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

rugby team, toured Great Britain.<sup>446</sup> The team was incredibly successful winning 31 out of 32 games, thus demonstrating their prowess and superior skills over the British teams.<sup>447</sup> As self-described rugby fanatic Tim Hobbs explained rugby became New Zealand's national sport because the All Blacks, as the team came to be known, were simply so good at it.<sup>448</sup>

I cannot stand the knockers of rugby, I mean it's a sport like any other and the All Blacks shouldn't be treated like gods, they are humans after all. But we have to reflect that for a nation of four or five million people, to have such a brilliant team, both in performance and standing. They are the most successful sporting team in the world. Now surely as a country we should rejoice in that and show a bit of respect and be proud of their ability and their culture.<sup>449</sup>

The 1924 All Blacks team were also welcomed home as heroes following their tour to the United Kingdom, Ireland, France, and Canada.<sup>450</sup> This team was nicknamed the 'Invincibles' by the New Zealand public due to the fact that the team won all 32 games that they played.<sup>451</sup> When the players returned home there were a number of public celebrations, including parades, with thousands of New Zealanders out in force to show their pride in the team.<sup>452</sup> According to rugby fan Michael Ward, the success of the All Blacks is, "something that I think you can be proud of. I mean it's good to be the best or you know up there [with] the best at anything and I take a lot of pride in that."<sup>453</sup> The All Blacks and their successes on the rugby field were something that New Zealanders were proud of and it is not surprising that it became New Zealand's national sport.

---

<sup>446</sup> 'Originals kick off All Black tradition,' last updated 19 January 2017, <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/originals-kick-off-all-black-tradition>.

<sup>447</sup> 'Originals kick off All Black tradition.'

<sup>448</sup> Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016.

<sup>449</sup> Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016.

<sup>450</sup> Swan, *History of New Zealand Rugby Football*, 206.

<sup>451</sup> Swan, *History of New Zealand Rugby Football*, 206.

<sup>452</sup> Malcolm MacLean, 'Of Warriors and Blokes: The problem of Maori rugby for Pakeha masculinity in New Zealand,' *Making the Rugby World: Race, gender, commerce*, ed. by Timothy J.L. Chandler and John Nauright, (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1999), 7.

<sup>453</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

It is clear that during the 1970s and early 1980s rugby was such an integral part of New Zealand society to the point where it was seen as a 'national religion' by some New Zealanders.<sup>454</sup> Brian Hays believes that there was "only one religion in New Zealand – rugby."<sup>455</sup> Rugby games were broadcast both on radio and television with sports commentators, such as Winston McCarthy, becoming household names.<sup>456</sup> While test matches appeared to draw the country to a halt.<sup>457</sup> Rugby was described as "all encompassing" and "as a central institution of New Zealand life."<sup>458</sup> Participants, who supported the Tour, loved rugby because it was the country's national sport and thus they wanted to see it played in New Zealand, particularly against the Springboks who were considered to be the All Blacks' biggest rugby rival.

Principally for the rugby, that was my main thing [because] I was right into the rugby. I was a rugby fanatic and I wanted to see us try and beat the Springboks. **Michael Ward.**<sup>459</sup>

Winning games and test matches against teams in the United Kingdom, Australia, and Europe was incredibly important to All Blacks' fans however, South Africa was seen as New Zealand's greatest rugby foe. The rugby rivalry between South Africa and New Zealand dates back to the early twentieth century and with test series during tours predominantly being won by South Africa, it is not surprising that New Zealanders were so passionate about games between the All Blacks and Springboks. Leon Eccersall explained that it was these games which really ignited the passion and desire to win in his family as "they were our main rivals back then, [a] great rugby nation."<sup>460</sup> According to Palenski, it was "[t]he intensity of competition between the two teams, and the depth of passion felt by supporters,

---

<sup>454</sup> When asked if rugby was comparable to a national religion there was a consensus amongst the majority of the participants that this statement was correct and that for many New Zealanders it was a very important part of the country's culture and identity: Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016; Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016; Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016; Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>455</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>456</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>457</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>458</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016, and Fougere, 'Sport, Culture and Identity,' 114.

<sup>459</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>460</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

[that] were significant contributors to the determination to keep playing each other in later years when much of the world cried for them to stop.”<sup>461</sup> Those who supported the Tour wanted to watch the All Blacks and Springboks play New Zealand’s national game. It was therefore the participants enjoyment of the game of rugby which motivated them to support the Tour and attend the games.

### Rugby and Politics

In 1981, Tour supporters believed that rugby and politics should not mix. Rugby was simply a game that was completely separate from political issues. This view was held by all of the participants who supported the Tour and they all identified it as a contributing factor which influenced their decision to support the Tour.<sup>462</sup>

That was my belief, definitely, back then. I thought that they’re two separate bodies and rugby’s rugby and politics is politics and they shouldn’t mix. I realise they do, in a lot of cases around the world. **Michael Ward.**<sup>463</sup>

At the time, I’d have to say I would’ve thought yes, I did and that might’ve been pretty naive and pretty short-sighted at the time. But in those days sport administered sport and politics administered politics and I’d never come across it before really. I might’ve had my eyes closed and been short-sighted, but [the] New Zealand Rugby Union organised rugby and the Government organised the Government and tennis organised tennis, you know those sorts of things. At the time, I didn’t think sport and politics should mix and the world’s changed since then dramatically so now I suppose we have to, I mean there’s just too much at stake, the Government has to be involved. **Brian Hays.**<sup>464</sup>

---

<sup>461</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 252.

<sup>462</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016; Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016; Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>463</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>464</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

The participants' views on sport not mixing with politics was fostered by Muldoon's Government and the NZRFU at the time. The Government's non-interference policy was a blatant example of the Government not becoming involved in sporting matters. The Government's belief that the final decision to invite the Springboks should be left up to the NZRFU also fostered the idea that sport and politics were separate, in that rugby was solely the responsibility of the Union and not the Government. Muldoon also solidified this idea by stating, on a number of occasions, that rugby and politics did not mix. Furthermore, when the NZRFU invited the Springboks to tour it justified its decision to do so by stating that the NZRFU's job was to administer and promote rugby and that it did not involve itself in political issues. Ces Blazey, Chairman of the NZRFU, confirmed the NZRFU's position by stating that, "it is necessary to remind ourselves of our function and responsibilities. They are to administer an amateur sport; not to seek to change the political system in any country."<sup>465</sup> By inviting the Springboks to tour in 1981 the NZRFU was fulfilling this purpose and acting in the interests of the game. One anonymous Christchurch student, writing shortly after the Tour, believed that the "NZRFU has the right to invite whom-so-ever it chooses, regardless of race, religion, creed or association, provided that the invitation is issued in accordance with the internal regulations of the NZRFU as accepted by its members."<sup>466</sup> The idea that sports and politics should not mix influenced a number of New Zealanders to support the Tour. The belief that rugby should not be affected by something which was out of the control of the NZRFU, in this case the political policy of another country, meant that many New Zealanders did not see any issue with the Tour going ahead. For pro-Tour participants, the Springboks and the Tour had nothing to do with the policy of apartheid because they believed that sports and politics were separate. In hindsight, many Tour supporters felt that they were naïve to believe this.<sup>467</sup>

---

<sup>465</sup> Ces Blazey, 'Statement: Tour – South Africa to NZ 1981,' 9 April 1981, in Ron Palenski, *Rugby: A New Zealand history*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015), 366.

<sup>466</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 24-113474,' Springbok Rugby Tour Papers, University of Canterbury, 1981, accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

<sup>467</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016; Hays [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.



I was naïve. I [was] blissfully thinking this would go ahead [and] it would enlighten society. [We] would come back talking rugby tales and rugby victories to our glorious All Blacks or whatever like we had with previous touring teams. I really hoped that it would've been a repeat of that, but now I suppose rather than say oh the 1981 Springbok Tour and you'd go bang bang bang and you name the matches and you named the points, you don't do that. You say first thing that comes to mind Red and Blue Squad, protesters, civil disobedience. That's, I think, the first thing that nearly always comes up. **Leon Eccersall**.<sup>468</sup>

### 'They picked on my sport'

Many New Zealanders also wanted to lend their support to rugby in New Zealand which they felt was being singled out by the anti-apartheid movement and the international community. There continued to be sporting contact between South Africa and a number of other countries, besides New Zealand. However, this contact did not garner the same response from those who opposed sporting contact with South Africa. For instance, the British Lions' tour of South Africa in 1980 received little condemnation from the international community in comparison to that which was received when the NZRFU invited the Springboks to tour in 1981. It should be noted that Britain had also signed the Gleneagles Agreement and therefore failed in its commitment to it when the invitation from the SARB was accepted.<sup>469</sup> In Britain, the decision to allow the team to tour was left to the governing rugby bodies who were warned by the Government about the possible impact of a tour. However, the British Government was not internationally condemned by the UN and Commonwealth for allowing the team to go to South Africa. The lack of response from the public and international groups may have been because rugby was not Britain's national sport. Therefore, it may not have been classified as a major sporting event and thus received less attention than the 1981 Tour. However, this lack of response resulted in Tour supporters feeling that rugby and New Zealand had been singled out by the Commonwealth, UN, and those countries who threatened to boycott sporting events at which New

---

<sup>468</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>469</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 178.

Zealand participated. Supporters felt that it was unfair that New Zealand appeared to be bearing the brunt of international condemnation and by supporting the Tour they were fighting back against this injustice. Tour supporters also questioned the consistency of protesters as New Zealand continued to have sporting contacts with other countries that had human rights issues and yet did not receive attention from demonstrators.

If you are going to protest against the political system of South Africa then, similarly, you must protest against tours by other countries of equally questionable political systems.<sup>470</sup>

Well I think they should've publicised what was going on in other countries as well rather than just South Africa, [especially] in Russia and even China. **Kevin Taylor.**<sup>471</sup>

However, William Anderson refutes this argument by stating that the issue at the time was about apartheid in South Africa not about democracy in general.<sup>472</sup> Chris Smith agrees that apartheid was the major issue and that HART had been formed to combat apartheid specifically.<sup>473</sup>

Furthermore, Tour supporters felt that rugby had been singled out especially when other sporting codes continued to have contact with South Africa. Brian Hays recalls the South African golfer, Gary Player, who played in New Zealand despite being an outspoken supporter of the apartheid regime.<sup>474</sup> Brian cites this as another reason why he strongly supported the Tour.

Garry Player the golfer and our golfers, Bob Charles, and those people would still play in golf opens overseas with South African players. Basically, this is why I felt really strong that, you know, my sport, which was the national religion of New Zealand, fair enough, and that's okay they chose the biggest sport to pick on, but they picked on rugby and obviously [that] had a

---

<sup>470</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 17-113467.'

<sup>471</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>472</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>473</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>474</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

huge impact. It [was] really one of the things that really annoyed me, that, you know, these other sports could just carry on.<sup>475</sup>

There were a number of secondary reasons why many New Zealanders supported the Tour however, it was their enjoyment of the game of rugby that had the most impact on their pro-Tour stance. They felt passionate about rugby and wanted to see the All Blacks play New Zealand's national sport. This was the participants' primary motivation to support the Tour.

---

<sup>475</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

### Chapter Three: Day 28 – The myth of protester violence

This chapter discusses the protest tactics which were used by anti-apartheid demonstrators in order to convey their message to the Government, the NZRFU, and the wider New Zealand public, that the Springboks were not welcome in New Zealand. The popular perception exists that in order to cancel the Tour, anti-apartheid demonstrators and organisations utilised tactics which included violence and vandalism. This belief was further perpetuated by the media at the time as it tended to focus on acts of violence, which were more newsworthy, than peaceful protests. This chapter argues that despite these views on protester tactics by those who supported the Tour and the media, not all demonstrators resorted to violence. Anti-apartheid organisation, HART, did not condone nor support any acts of violence or vandalism and therefore implemented a range of other tactics in order to stop the Tour from proceeding. The majority of tactics focussed upon education, promotion of HART's cause, and mobilising as many New Zealanders as possible against the Tour. Once the Springboks arrived and it became clear that the Tour would not be called off, tactics did become more extreme and violence was used by some individuals. However, the actions of some demonstrators should not be representative of the entire anti-apartheid movement. Rather, the majority of anti-apartheid demonstrators from this study believe that violence was not acceptable, nor an effective method to achieving the movement's aims.

#### Public Perception, the Media, and the Myth of Protester Violence

By all means protest, in fact there were many [protesters] outside [Lancaster Park] trying to get in and they were devising all sorts of methods to disturb the game. I could not condone putting glass and tacks [on the field] as they tried to do. [There was] a big crowd of volunteers, immediately after, [that] remove[d] them from the pitch, [they were] checking the pitch and picking up glass and nails and stuff like that. So, I was angry with [the protesters] at the time and had no sympathy for their cause. **Tim Hobbs.**<sup>476</sup>

---

<sup>476</sup> Hobbs [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016

I didn't have an issue with the protesters at all. I couldn't have cared less if they'd have lined the streets going to the ground with their placards. If they'd have sat round the ground with their placards I couldn't have cared, that would've been great. [It] would've showed it on TV and showed that we were not into what was going on [in South Africa], but when they crossed the line with the violence and ripping up people's fence posts and throwing tacks on the rugby fields and then of course that created a backlash from the police which no one liked to see. I think that was a lot to do with the anti-Tour feeling cause it just disrupted everyone's life and put people against the whole thing. **Michael Ward.**<sup>477</sup>

Tour supporters believed that all anti-apartheid protesters who demonstrated against the Tour resorted to violence and vandalism to force the cancellation of the Tour.<sup>478</sup> This belief existed due to the fact that acts of violence and vandalism did occur, particularly as the Tour progressed and it became clear that it would not be cancelled. Out of frustration that the Tour continued to proceed, despite widespread protest, some demonstrators resorted to more extreme tactics, such as the spreading of tacks and glass on the rugby field at Lancaster Park. These types of actions made Tour supporters incredibly angry, as it put people's health and safety at risk.<sup>479</sup> Tim Hobbs and Michael Ward could simply not understand why demonstrators decided that violence and vandalism would help the anti-apartheid cause. For Tour supporters, these tactics discredited the wider anti-apartheid movement.<sup>480</sup> Former Police Constable Leon Eccersall believes that the movement would have been more successful if they had continued with street theatre and marches, rather than attempting to break onto rugby fields and get into confrontations with police.<sup>481</sup> Leon felt that educational tactics gave the group "more credibility because it was non-threatening and non-violent and you can build a

---

<sup>477</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>478</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016; Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>479</sup> Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>480</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016; Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>481</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

message with entertainment.”<sup>482</sup> Tim agreed, in that there were far better ways for demonstrators to show their opposition to the Tour. For him, the anti-apartheid movement lost all credibility after the Christchurch test match because of the tactics that were employed to stop the game being played. It was at this point that Tim lost all sympathy for the protesters and their cause.<sup>483</sup>

The belief held by Tour supporters, that all protesters resorted to acts of violence, was perpetuated by the media at the time. A number of media reports on the Tour focussed on the violence which occurred rather than on the protest movement as a whole. According to former journalist, Don Cameron, this was due to the fact that, to a certain extent, the New Zealand media lost its perspective on the issue. Journalists in New Zealand had never before covered anything like the Tour and the riot-like conditions that it created on New Zealand’s streets.<sup>484</sup> A photograph of a demonstrator fighting with a rugby supporter was something new and therefore it became news.<sup>485</sup> Whereas, a photograph of a silent vigil was something that New Zealand had seen prior to the Tour and therefore it was not news. The media’s reaction to the Tour and the reporting of the sensational, rather than the mundane, gave the appearance that all demonstrations were violent and all demonstrators were intent on violence.<sup>486</sup> It is therefore not surprising that one of the myths of the Tour is that violence was the only protest tactic that was used. However, this was not the case. Education and the promotion of the anti-apartheid cause were key tactics which were used by anti-apartheid organisations in order get their views across to the wider New Zealand public. HART’s non-violence policy was also essential in shaping the strategies used when attempting to ensure the cancellation of the Tour or individual games. Despite the emphasis on non-violence and education, violence was used by a small number of radical individuals and groups however; their tactics should not be representative of the entire anti-apartheid movement.

---

<sup>482</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>483</sup> Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016.

<sup>484</sup> Don Cameron, *Barbed Wire Boks*, (Auckland: Rugby Press, 1981), 39.

<sup>485</sup> Cameron, *Barbed Wire Boks*, 39.

<sup>486</sup> Cameron, *Barbed Wire Boks*, 39.

### Anti-apartheid organisations and the policy of non-violence

A number of anti-apartheid groups were established in New Zealand with the primary purpose of demonstrating against sports tours that were organised on a racial basis and against apartheid in general. The most prominent of these groups was HART which was officially established on July 15 1969.<sup>487</sup> HART established coalitions in each of the main cities and all but one study participant, who opposed the Tour, belonged to the Christchurch chapter.<sup>488</sup> The main reason that participants joined HART was to demonstrate their opposition to apartheid and the best way to do so was to join an anti-apartheid movement which would organise marches and protests.

If you have a particular belief you should involve yourself in it in some way, rather than just being on the edges, you should do something, hear what other people have to say. **Chris Smith.**<sup>489</sup>

Being a part of an organisation also meant that people were surrounded by others that had similar beliefs. People could therefore work together to achieve common goals.<sup>490</sup> Furthermore, Chris felt that there was safety in numbers and felt more comfortable about actively protesting knowing that she was a part of something and would not be alone.<sup>491</sup>

It should be noted that it was not only HART that rallied New Zealanders to protest against the Tour and apartheid, there were a number of other organisations. In Christchurch alone there were 41 different groups which included trade unions, Māori groups, and various churches.<sup>492</sup> Two of the more prominent groups were Students Against the Tour, established by students at the University of Canterbury, and the Christchurch Coalition Against the Tour (CAT) which was primarily a trade union

---

<sup>487</sup> Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*, 43.

<sup>488</sup> Of the seven participants who were anti-Tour, only one of them, William Anderson, did not belong to HART.

<sup>489</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>490</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>491</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>492</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 11.

group.<sup>493</sup> Brent Burnett-Jones and Debbie Osborn were members of CAT, with Brent acting as their trade union representative.<sup>494</sup>

In Christchurch, the local HART chapter, led by a few prominent individuals, such as Marion Hobbs and Paddy Moore, was a collaborative movement that allowed people to share their ideas.<sup>495</sup>

There were leaders in the group and I'd done some voluntary work earlier, a few years earlier, for women's' refuge and it was that idea of the leaderless group and actually, unless you've got really good decision-making tools you can just go around in circles and that was a frustrating thing for me. So, HART didn't go around in circles and everybody got a chance to speak. **Christine Beardsley.**<sup>496</sup>

Christchurch HART held regular meetings in order to discuss strategies, upcoming protests and to inform and educate those who attended about South Africa's racial policies. Debbie recalls that there was usually a meeting a few nights before a big protest so that the leaders could discuss plans with the group.<sup>497</sup> The leaders would explain where to meet, what was going to happen, and how demonstrators were expected to behave.

In March 1971, HART had adopted a policy of "massive nation-wide non-violent disruption," in order to get their message, of opposition to apartheid, across to the public and Government.<sup>498</sup> It was announced that violence towards people and property would not be tolerated or sanctioned by HART.<sup>499</sup> According to Richards, this new policy of direct action would raise HART's public profile, but the emphasis on non-violence would ensure that public education became one of HART's main priorities.<sup>500</sup> HART reaffirmed this policy during the lead up to the 1981 Tour with the National Council

---

<sup>493</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 10 and 15.

<sup>494</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016; Burnett-Jones, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 22 August 2016, and Osborn, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 3 August 2016.

<sup>495</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>496</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>497</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>498</sup> Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*, 59.

<sup>499</sup> Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*, 59.

<sup>500</sup> Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*, 59.



announcing that demonstrations would be held throughout the country which would “involve direct action and civil disobedience,” however, these would be “based on the principles of non-violent direct action.”<sup>501</sup> In order to ensure that demonstrators did not resort to violence if provoked or use it in order to get their message across, a number of non-violent training sessions were held by HART. These training sessions were designed to prepare demonstrators for situations either with police or Tour supporters that could become violent.<sup>502</sup> According to Juliet Morris, these sessions ensured that there was a contingency plan for all situations, so that actions could be carried out as planned without any issues arising.<sup>503</sup> Brent and Chris recall attending these training sessions:

We did training for it most of which worked, some of which was totally ridiculous, but we knew what we were doing in the end. The training was interesting. The first time we ever had a big training meeting we set up these scenarios and we overloaded the scenarios so everything happened at once and it was total chaos. One of the people who was with us was an ex-London cop and he told us we’re a pack of idiots and this is what you should be doing and we sorted it out. But we did all sorts of training; how you handled it and how you faced the police lines without getting into trouble. We switched back cause I remember there’s a line of us, we’re the police, and there’s a line of people, they’re the protesters, and it was trying to see how we could keep control, how they could harass us. I was supposed to be focussing on the person in front of me, but all of a sudden, I reached over and arrested a woman in front of the cop next to me and that caused confusion. I said no she’s totally out of line, I’m a cop I’m arresting her. Oh, you need to look at your sides don’t you, but we never got into that line of harassment [with] the police that I’m aware of. **Brent Burnett-Jones.**<sup>504</sup>

That was quite interesting because I’d never really thought about [non-violent direct action] and then that came back to Gandhi you know [and] what he’d done and Parihaka and things

---

<sup>501</sup> Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*, 219.

<sup>502</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 21.

<sup>503</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 23.

<sup>504</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

like that, you know you were told sit, don't move. Yep I did do those [non-violent training sessions]. **Chris Smith.**<sup>505</sup>

These training sessions were particularly useful for Brent, who volunteered to be a protest marshal, during the Tour. The sessions helped Brent to learn to read certain situations and ensure that nobody got into any trouble with police or Tour supporters.

As a marshal, we kept between them [the police] and the demonstrators, to keep the demonstration flowing easily and when we were marching down the road we were the ones between the people on the side walk and the marchers, you know 'no leave them alone, keep going, that's what we're doing, we're marching,' and you know directing traffic occasionally. While I've talked about relating to the police, most of it was actually just keeping the march flowing. If someone started to heckle them make sure the marchers didn't divert and get into an argument with them, just ignore them, it's not worth it, keep going.<sup>506</sup>

The insistence on non-violent direct action by HART meant that there was a focus on education and creating public awareness of apartheid throughout 1980 and early 1981. HART wanted to educate New Zealanders about what was happening in South Africa as a result of apartheid.<sup>507</sup> HART believed that an increase in knowledge and understanding of the issues would stir New Zealanders to oppose the Tour. It was hoped that by educating the public, particularly those New Zealanders who were still undecided on the Tour issue, they would be persuaded to oppose it because they now understood that the apartheid regime was morally wrong.<sup>508</sup> Initially HART's protest tactics reflected this focus on the education of the New Zealand public.

---

<sup>505</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>506</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>507</sup> Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*, 206.

<sup>508</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

### HART's Protest Tactics

In order to educate the wider New Zealand public a range of activities and events were organised by HART, which provided information on apartheid in South Africa. These activities included street theatre, public meetings, film screenings, and information stalls.<sup>509</sup> Pamphlets and newspapers were also distributed and sold in order to dispense information to the public.

At one point, I even sold HART newspapers in the Square which is fun, you're either abused or laughed at. Some people bought them. Whether it did any good I don't know, but we were a presence so it was always going on. Basically, I was a warm body taking part in what was needed where I could. **Brent Burnett-Jones.**<sup>510</sup>

Speaking tours were also arranged throughout New Zealand with residents of various African countries discussing the situation in South Africa.<sup>511</sup> Henry Issacs, a leading anti-apartheid campaigner from South Africa, spoke at a CAT conference in Christchurch.<sup>512</sup> Jocelyn Papprell also recalls attending rallies in Cathedral Square where leaders of HART would speak to the assembled crowd about issues of inequality in South Africa in regards to education and opportunity.<sup>513</sup>

People would talk about some of these things. I've learnt something new today, you know.

The people who were speaking in the Square obviously had done a bit more, a bit more in touch with the ANC, and other organisations than those of us who were just ordinary folks.<sup>514</sup>

Rugby supporter, Michael Ward, however, questioned what the New Zealand public was being told with regards to what was actually happening in South Africa. Michael, who moved to South Africa during the Tour, had listened to speeches by people, such as John Minto and Trevor Richards, about the apartheid regime.<sup>515</sup> He was therefore prepared to see this blatant segregation, as described by

---

<sup>509</sup> Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*, 206.

<sup>510</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>511</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 9, and Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*, 206.

<sup>512</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 9.

<sup>513</sup> Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016.

<sup>514</sup> Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016.

<sup>515</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

anti-apartheid demonstrators. However, when he arrived in South Africa, society appeared to be somewhat different to what he had been told.

On the first night, I arrived in South Africa, getting the bus to the hotel and I just couldn't believe it – there [were] black people on the bus with white people and I thought well this isn't what I'm told was happening. I was very aware of wanting to see these things for myself so I was quite interested to see what was gonna happen and I was quite astounded. Then the other vivid memory I have was the next morning, coming down from the hotel room into the open sort of breakfast bar that led onto the main street in Johannesburg, and just the feeling [that] I was in the minority. There were so many black people there and I don't know, I just sort of felt what we were being told, that there was so much segregation, that big cities [were] mainly white people [and] black people lived in the townships and so forth. But this wasn't the case, there [were] coloureds and blacks walking past in pinstripe suits, going to and from work, driving Mercedes Benz. I couldn't believe it, but there [were] blacks and whites driving these cars, these beautiful cars. I even took some photos which I've got [in] an album there which I felt a bit stupid about doing, but I just thought I've gotta take some photos cause this is not what we've been told [what] life was like. So, I was quite amazed, that was my initial thoughts of [my] very first day in Johannesburg. It's just how people were mingling and just carrying on like normal, like it was just an ordinary business day in downtown Auckland.<sup>516</sup>

Michael did see segregation, particularly when it came to where people lived, with black and coloured South Africans only living in the townships. However, he saw black and white South Africans intermingling during the day, at work, where they treated one another with respect.<sup>517</sup> Michael learnt about apartheid by going to South Africa and experiencing a society that was different from what he had been told.<sup>518</sup>

---

<sup>516</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>517</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>518</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

Educating the wider New Zealand public was incredibly important for HART Christchurch, as was promoting their cause. A number of events were therefore organised that helped to inform the public and make them aware of HART's aim of stopping the Tour from proceeding. For instance, a bike ride between Christchurch and Timaru was held on April 24 in order to educate communities in South Canterbury, particularly in more rural areas, about apartheid in South Africa.<sup>519</sup> Morris also believes that activities such as this were ideal for stimulating debate, gaining a reaction – either positive or negative – and attracting media attention.<sup>520</sup> In Washdyke, Ian Stewart, who had cycled from Christchurch, had an in-depth conversation with a number of local people.<sup>521</sup> He was surprised that they were so interested in listening to what he had to say, but that was the purpose of the bike ride, to make people more aware and for Ian it was therefore a successful event.<sup>522</sup> In June, there was also another 'Bike Ride Against the Tour' which departed from Cranmer Square.<sup>523</sup> Only 50 people attended, which included a number of families, however it was about getting the information out to people in a way that was seen as non-threatening.<sup>524</sup> A bike ride, which families could attend, was therefore a creative way to make the anti-apartheid movement known to the public, while also educating those who were less-informed about apartheid in South Africa. It is evident that in the lead up to the Tour, HART's protest tactics were centred solely around the education and promotion of their cause to the wider New Zealand public.

More traditional forms of protest were also employed by HART in order to get their message across to the public, the Government, and the NZRFU. These protest tactics included marches and sit-ins which were held throughout New Zealand prior to the Springboks' arrival. In order to demonstrate to the Government the increasing opposition to the Tour, HART organised two nationwide mass

---

<sup>519</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 71-113559,' Springbok Rugby Tour Papers, University of Canterbury, 1981, accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

<sup>520</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 11.

<sup>521</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 12.

<sup>522</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 12.

<sup>523</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 71-113559.'

<sup>524</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 71-113559.'

mobilisations. According to Morris, many people believed that there was still hope that the Tour would be cancelled if opposition was seen to be substantial.<sup>525</sup> The two mobilisations were to take place on May 1 and July 3, and preparation for these events began months in advance. According to Tom Newnham of CARE, “hundreds of thousands of posters and leaflets were printed,” and distributed throughout the country in the hope of raising public interest in the marches and thus get people onto the streets on May 1.<sup>526</sup>

In Christchurch, four separate marches were organised from different starting points that would then arrive in Cathedral Square. A short rally with speeches, chants, and songs would be held and finally the group would march through the city and back to Cathedral Square. Approximately 75,000 people were out in force throughout the country on May 1 to illustrate their opposition to the Tour with major rallies being held in all of the main centres.<sup>527</sup> In Christchurch, it was estimated that between 12,000 and 15,000 people converged on Cathedral Square.<sup>528</sup> Dave Small of CAT gave a speech at the rally, in which he outlined that people from all walks of life had come to Cathedral Square to tell the Government that they did not want the Springboks in New Zealand.<sup>529</sup> Brent was a protest marshal for the group that arrived at Cathedral Square from Lancaster Park. He remembers walking down Manchester Street, looking into each of the side streets and just seeing hundreds of people marching towards Cathedral Square.<sup>530</sup> He recalls thinking that there was simply no choice for the Government but to cancel the Tour.

---

<sup>525</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 11.

<sup>526</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 11, and Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 11.

<sup>527</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 11.

<sup>528</sup> ‘Springbok Tour Archive no. 71-113559.’

<sup>529</sup> ‘Springbok Tour Archive no. 72-113560,’ Springbok Rugby Tour Papers, University of Canterbury, 1981, accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

<sup>530</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

The numbers were there, and I thought it can't go ahead, it can't go ahead, and then the big crowd in the Square [and] you think this is going on all over the country and I thought no the Government must recognise [this].<sup>531</sup>

The May 1 mobilisation was considered hugely successful by anti-apartheid groups because of the large numbers of people who joined the march to show their opposition.<sup>532</sup> According to Morris, this march differed significantly from ones that would occur as the Tour progressed, not only because of the size, but also the atmosphere.<sup>533</sup> The scene in Cathedral Square could be compared to that of a festival because of the relaxed atmosphere.<sup>534</sup> People were chanting, singing, and carrying placards, thus peacefully making their presence and their position known.<sup>535</sup> It was seen as a positive way to get the message through to the Government that many New Zealanders did not support the Tour.

It was generally, I won't say light-hearted cause it was serious, but there was a friendly, family atmosphere especially amongst the protesters and even some of the senior cops got in on it.

**Brent Burnett-Jones.**<sup>536</sup>

People were laughing and I was with, I think my mum and dad might have come to those earlier ones, and a lot of the family. **Debbie Osborn.**<sup>537</sup>

The relaxed nature and atmosphere of the earlier protests was reflected in the people who attended, with whole families marching through Christchurch's streets. Christine Beardsley recalls taking her children along with her to a number of marches that were held before the Springboks arrived.<sup>538</sup>

I occasionally took the kids, cause my littlest was probably four. [We would] protest with him in the pushchair, but once the Springboks came I could see that it was more unpredictable.

---

<sup>531</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>532</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 17.

<sup>533</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 17.

<sup>534</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 17.

<sup>535</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>536</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>537</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>538</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

Once people started taking actions then the week that my husband had the kids I'd go out on a demonstration without them, although sometimes in the weekend we'd take them altogether.<sup>539</sup>

Chris Smith also took her children to the early protests however, as the Tour progressed she decided against taking them, "we used to go every Saturday marching and it would depend on how I read the situation as to what it might be like that we would take the kids."<sup>540</sup> Once the Springboks arrived, the crowds at protests began to reflect the increasingly tense nature of the situation. Children were no longer brought along, rather friends and family were asked to look after them whilst their parents went out onto the streets. Christine recalls constantly thinking whilst out on protests that she could not get arrested or injured because she had to get home to her children.<sup>541</sup>

Following the May 1 mass mobilisation there was a considerable decline in activity by anti-apartheid organisations. People were "tired" and "dispirited" following the march because the Government and NZRFU had not changed their stance on the Tour, it had not been cancelled and thus the march had not been as successful as first thought.<sup>542</sup> There were a number of other events and activities that were planned by Christchurch's anti-apartheid groups, however these "lacked the impetus and fever of [the] build-up to May 1."<sup>543</sup> One of these events was the occupation of the Canterbury Rugby Union offices on June 16, the anniversary of the massacre in Soweto in 1976.<sup>544</sup> This occupation was organised by a group called Action Against the Tour, which was made up of people who had in the past been actively involved in political protest movements, such as those against the Vietnam War.<sup>545</sup> The group wanted to go further than simply marching to show their opposition, however they also needed to remain true to the idea of non-violent direct action, as was the policy of HART and the

---

<sup>539</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>540</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>541</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>542</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no.71-113559.'

<sup>543</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no.71-113559.'

<sup>544</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 23.

<sup>545</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 23.



majority of anti-apartheid organisations.<sup>546</sup> The occupation of the Canterbury Rugby Union offices occurred as planned with 12 members of Action Against the Tour successfully shutting themselves in. They were arrested for their actions with police breaking down the door to evict them from the offices. They were eventually discharged without conviction.<sup>547</sup> According to Morris, these actions were “one of the most effective examples of non-violent direct action that Christchurch witnessed during the 1981 Springbok Tour protests.”<sup>548</sup> This was because the actions of the group highlighted the violence and actions which might be needed to ensure the Springbok Tour went ahead.<sup>549</sup>

On July 3, the second mass mobilisation was held throughout the country. Unfortunately, this march was not as successful as that of May 1. HART’s National Council had decided to proceed with the second march with little consultation with the various regional branches. Along with the exhaustion felt by many protesters after the first march and the feelings of frustration at not having succeeded in ensuring the cancellation of the Tour, many people were less than enthusiastic about the second mass mobilisation.<sup>550</sup> According to Morris, the build-up to this march was similar to the first, with leaflet drops and advertising, however this was not reflected in the numbers who participated on the day.<sup>551</sup> Approximately 5,000 people attended the rally in Cathedral Square, considerably less than the first march.<sup>552</sup> At this point there was some concern that the anti-apartheid movement had run out of steam before the Springboks had even arrived. This was certainly not the case; more militant action was called for by protesters in order to make a statement.

As the Tour drew closer and frustration grew amongst anti-apartheid campaigners because the Government and NZRFU were not making moves to cancel the Tour, there was an escalation in the types of protest tactics that HART began to use. The focus moved from education and promotion of

---

<sup>546</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 23.

<sup>547</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 25.

<sup>548</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 25.

<sup>549</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 25.

<sup>550</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 29.

<sup>551</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 29.

<sup>552</sup> ‘Springbok Tour Archive no.71-113559.’

the cause to civil disobedience. The use of such tactics was to ensure that the Government and NZRFU had no choice but to take notice of the demands of many New Zealanders to cancel the Tour.

One of the more prominent events in Christchurch was Tent City. This was the first mass act of non-violent civil disobedience used by anti-apartheid demonstrators in Christchurch.<sup>553</sup> HART and CAT decided that they would stage a mass sit-in in Latimer Square on July 3 in order to, not only boost the morale of demonstrators, but also to send a clear message to the Government.<sup>554</sup> Latimer Square was designated by HART and CAT as a 'No Tour State,' a new republic which was separate and independent from New Zealand, in that it did not accept the jurisdiction of the New Zealand Government until "it honoured its obligation to stop the Tour."<sup>555</sup> The use of tents served to illustrate the permanency and determination of the movement to get its message across.<sup>556</sup> Brent Burnett-Jones was one of the demonstrators who spent the weekend in Tent City.

I suddenly became an incredibly important person at Tent City, I had a key to the Trade Union Centre around the corner – the Trade Union Centre had toilets. I was there for most of the weekend. Anyway, this drunk, he came and stopped on the road and abused us. One of the motorbike gangs came past at one stage and start[ed] to give us a hard time. It was just everybody into the tents and they came round [and] then [you] could hear one of them urinating on the outside of the tent, but we stayed and just quietly they went away. Anyway this [drunk] guy went round the block [in his car], came round and then he just turned onto the grass and accelerated straight at a group of us. Now, as I said, I'm not the most fit person around, I was a whole lot fitter back then and I remember having to run to get out of the way of him. We actually called a cop on that and then we're telling him about it and he came back and I said that's him over there he's just come back, so he was arrested and I had to be a witness against him in court. I remember being asked in court how fast was he going, 'I don't

---

<sup>553</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 45.

<sup>554</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 30.

<sup>555</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 28 and 30.

<sup>556</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 30.

know how fast he was going, but I had to run to get out of his way.' So, he was convicted I can't remember what happened on that.<sup>557</sup>

Apart from the incident with the drunk driver, who appeared to take offence at the demonstrators' position on the Tour, Tent City was a peaceful protest. Brent believes that it helped to get the message across to the Government and the NZRFU that the anti-apartheid movement was not going to give up when it came to the Tour.<sup>558</sup> Despite the small number of demonstrators actually involved in the mass sit-in, it was still seen to be a successful exercise which ensured the anti-apartheid movement retained the attention of the Government.<sup>559</sup> Further protest tactics, which were more militant in nature, were used to garner attention for the anti-apartheid movement. One of the more prominent actions in Christchurch was a hunger strike led by members of Action Against the Tour. Whilst in Addington Remand Prison, four men, who were arrested for entering the Canterbury Rugby Union Officers and pouring blood throughout, went on a hunger strike which lasted two weeks.<sup>560</sup> These actions illustrate how far some New Zealanders were willing to go in order to get their message across.

Prior to the Springboks' arrival in New Zealand, no acts of violence by protesters had taken place. The anti-apartheid movement firmly believed that violence was not necessary which is why, despite tactics becoming more militant in nature, no violence had yet occurred between police, protesters, and Tour supporters. However, acts of vandalism had already been perpetrated in Christchurch before the arrival of the Springboks with the Canterbury Rugby Union offices being repeatedly broken into and graffitied. Once the Springboks had arrived in New Zealand acts of vandalism by anti-apartheid groups and individuals increased.

On July 22, during the first game of the Tour between the Springboks and Poverty Bay in Gisborne, a march took place in Christchurch which finished at Lancaster Park.<sup>561</sup> A fence was ripped down as

---

<sup>557</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>558</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>559</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 30.

<sup>560</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 45.

<sup>561</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 71-113559.'

protesters attempted to gain access to the park, causing approximately \$2,000 worth of damage.<sup>562</sup> Further acts of vandalism were threatened by some anti-Tour protesters towards rugby clubs throughout Christchurch.<sup>563</sup> As the Tour continued and the number of demonstrations increased, police resources became incredibly stretched, meaning that there simply were not enough police personnel available to protect rugby grounds from possible vandalism. It therefore became the responsibility of individual rugby clubs to ensure that their grounds were protected. Rugby clubs asked for volunteers to patrol rugby fields and clubrooms, as well as Lancaster Park, if the NZRFU asked for assistance. Self-confessed rugby fanatic, Tim Hobbs, volunteered to patrol his rugby club, Burnside.

We were part of a group of guys that took turns rostered to look after our clubrooms, look after the fields because we had word that there could be protesters chopping down posts, spreading glass and nails over the pitch. It never happened, but I was there.<sup>564</sup>

Whether their presence was a deterrent for potential vandals or Burnside Rugby Club was simply not a high-profile target is unclear, however it was not vandalised during the Tour.<sup>565</sup> Unfortunately, other grounds did not escape acts of vandalism, such as Rugby Park where one of the grandstands was destroyed by fire in a suspected arson.<sup>566</sup> Rugby officials also feared that Lancaster Park would be the next target for anti-apartheid protesters and so people volunteered to patrol the grounds in the days leading up to the first test match.<sup>567</sup> Michael Ward and his father offered to patrol the park one night for a couple of hours.

We had a couple of meetings [at the rugby club] to see if people wanted to go along to support the Tour and just to say well if the Rugby Union did need some help at Lancaster Park, walking around the ground just to make sure no one got onto the ground leading up to the game. If

---

<sup>562</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 32(I)-113483.'

<sup>563</sup> Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016.

<sup>564</sup> Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016.

<sup>565</sup> Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016.

<sup>566</sup> Chapple, 1981, 187.

<sup>567</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

anyone wanted to volunteer to do a couple of hours doing that, which I did and my father did. So, we sort of turned up there not knowing what the hell we were supposed to do and just marched in there with our torches. [We] were told to march around the outside of Lancaster Park for an hour or so and then someone else would take over. It was just one of those things that we, the rugby players and the club, [did] together to help out. That was our little part – just to try and help. The police were pretty flat out obviously at the time cause the Springboks were in town then and so that was just our little bit, to go on patrol.<sup>568</sup>

No one did attempt to break into the park whilst Michael and his father were there, which was a relief for Michael, as he had no idea what they would have done if they had caught someone trying to get in.<sup>569</sup> However, Michael believes that he would have done whatever was necessary to stop any vandalism of Lancaster Park, which illustrates how strongly Michael felt about ensuring that the game went ahead.<sup>570</sup> Despite vandalism occurring relatively soon after the arrival of the Springboks in New Zealand, violence on a large scale did not break out until the rugby game in Hamilton on July 25. This game and the events that followed were to be the turning point in the Tour with regards to protest tactics.

### A change in tactics?

On July 25, the Springboks were set to play against Waikato at Rugby Park in Hamilton. The game was cancelled however, as a result of protester action. Approximately 200 protesters made it onto the rugby field, prior to the beginning of the game, while a plane made its way towards Rugby Park flown by Pat McQuarie, who had previously threatened to fly a plane into a grandstand.<sup>571</sup> Upon hearing about the plane, Police Commissioner Bob Walton, had no choice but to cancel the game and evacuate Rugby Park.<sup>572</sup> Unaware of this, rugby fans believed that the game had been cancelled because of the

---

<sup>568</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>569</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>570</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>571</sup> Shears and Gidley, *Storm out of Africa!*, 40.

<sup>572</sup> Shears and Gidley, *Storm out of Africa!*, 48.

protesters on the field and as they were leaving violence broke out. In Christchurch, a demonstration was organised to take place while the game in Hamilton was played. The march met in Latimer Square where the demonstrators heard, via radio, that hundreds of protesters had made their way onto the field.<sup>573</sup> There were cheers of joy and excitement which spread throughout the assembled group. The march then moved off to Christchurch Airport, where the group heard that the game had been cancelled.

Whilst protesting at Christchurch Airport a bomb was detonated in the men's toilet. This tactic was extreme and was the first of its type to be used in Christchurch. It is unclear who was responsible for the bomb as it went against the policy of non-violent civil disobedience followed by the majority of anti-apartheid organisations. Former Police Constable Leon Eccersall was at Christchurch Airport when the bomb exploded. According to police intelligence the demonstrators were planning to take over the control tower at Christchurch Airport, and Leon was one of the Police Officers who was sent to control the situation.<sup>574</sup> Upon arrival, the police car parked directly beside the toilet block just as the bomb detonated.

We just parked up outside the toilets and opened the doors and next thing it just went. It was pretty impressive, [a] shower of glass and boom everything that goes with an explosion and you thought what the hell was that about. Why would somebody do that. So, my off-sider and I, we just scurried into the toilet as quick as we can and it was just, it was a scene, like if anybody had been in there they would've required some pretty serious hospital intervention. It was totalled in there. So, that was the main thing to ascertain that nobody, fortuitously, [had] been in there at [the] time, nobody was injured, so it was just a case of cordoning it off, calling in more people.<sup>575</sup>

---

<sup>573</sup> Chapple, 1981, 92.

<sup>574</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>575</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

According to Leon, it was difficult to ascertain who had planted the bomb, particularly as no group or individual claimed responsibility for the act. However, it was his understanding that anti-apartheid organisations were not involved.<sup>576</sup> Rather, Leon believes that the bomb was detonated, at the same time that a large number of anti-apartheid demonstrators were at Christchurch Airport protesting, in order to implicate them in the violent act.<sup>577</sup> Leon feels that whoever was responsible for the bomb wanted to create the perception that protesters were terrible people, who “were going around blowing up things.”<sup>578</sup> Conversely another Christchurch Police Officer, writing at the time of Tour, believes that there were different categories of protesters who had different reasons for joining demonstrations.<sup>579</sup> He believed that approximately 60% of demonstrators in Christchurch belonged to the “genuinely concerned anti-apartheid protester” category and adhered to the anti-apartheid organisations’ policy of non-violence.<sup>580</sup> The group that did create issues for the police and used violent tactics was made up of people who took the opportunity that the Tour created, to confront police or simply joined in with the protests without knowing what they were really about. This group only made up approximately 20% of protesters in Christchurch according to the Officer.<sup>581</sup> Leon agrees that there were different categories of demonstrators, who used different tactics to get their message across. He believes that it is necessary to look at the different protest tactics, from marching, to sit-ins, and the bomb, and realise that the same people may not be responsible for every protest type.<sup>582</sup>

Despite the violence which had erupted between protesters, police, and rugby fans in Hamilton following the abandoned game, the Tour was not cancelled. The next rugby game was played in New Plymouth on the July 29; however, it was not the rugby, but the events which occurred in Wellington that would be widely remembered. Approximately 2,000 protesters marched through the streets of

---

<sup>576</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>577</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>578</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>579</sup> ‘Springbok Tour Archive no. 32(I)-113483.’

<sup>580</sup> ‘Springbok Tour Archive no. 32(I)-113483.’

<sup>581</sup> ‘Springbok Tour Archive no. 32(I)-113483.’

<sup>582</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

Wellington towards the South African ambassador's home.<sup>583</sup> The protesters were confronted by police who told them to turn around, however they did not stop. Police saw this as a refusal to obey orders and moved forward with batons raised.<sup>584</sup> This was the first time that batons had been used against New Zealanders. Demonstrators later stated that they had been unable to stop due to the large number of people behind those in the front lines which surged them towards the police.<sup>585</sup> Protesters also claimed that they had not heard any directions from police to stop.<sup>586</sup> People were crushed as they tried to move out of reach of the police, whilst others were hit across the face with batons.<sup>587</sup> According to Rachel Barrowman, the incident in Molesworth Street was the turning point of the Tour with regards to the tactics used by police and demonstrators.<sup>588</sup> There was an increase in the use of force by police and in response to this, demonstrators began to push back against police lines and use more extreme tactics.

The use of batons by police led to the use of protective clothing by demonstrators. According to Barrowman, "it was after Molesworth Street, and in direct response to Molesworth Street, that demonstrators ... began wearing helmets and protective clothing, in response to police tactics."<sup>589</sup> Brent Burnett-Jones recalls beginning to wear an array of protective attire following the events in Molesworth Street, which included a cricketer's box, shoulder pads, gloves, and a motorcycle helmet.<sup>590</sup> On the day of the Christchurch test match protective clothing was also worn. Jocelyn Papprell recalls her flatmates helping her to collect newspapers, which were then made into pads and

---

<sup>583</sup> Rachel Barrowman, 'A Report of the Molesworth Street Incident,' *The Police and the 1981 Tour*, ed. by Malcolm McKinnon, Peter McPhee, and Jock Phillips, (Wellington: Victoria University History Department, 1985), 23.

<sup>584</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 39.

<sup>585</sup> Barrowman, 'A Report of the Molesworth Street Incident,' 25.

<sup>586</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 39.

<sup>587</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 39.

<sup>588</sup> Barrowman, 'A Report of the Molesworth Street Incident,' 49.

<sup>589</sup> Barrowman, 'A Report of the Molesworth Street Incident,' 46.

<sup>590</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.



placed under her clothes to protect her if she got a baton to the kidneys.<sup>591</sup> Christine Beardsley went further still, using plastic down pipe to protect her arms.

I got some downpipe, plastic downpipe and I cut them to size. [It] came up to my elbow and another one [between the elbow and shoulder] cause I had this idea that if somebody tried to hit me in the face with a baton I would hold my arm up and stop them and it would just hit on this hard plastic and I wouldn't get my arm broken. So, I planned all this [and] I had these things on my arms. I [also] had on, which was really ridiculous, I had put my tramping boots on. Tramping boots in those days were bloody heavy and not like nice engineered ones you get nowadays, which are much lighter, and as I recall it the weather wasn't great that day, it wasn't like a hot day and I think I probably had quite a heavy jacket on. I also had a placard with a very strong piece of wood on it and I thought well I could hold that up as well to stop myself being, you know, damaged.<sup>592</sup>

Whilst some protesters armed themselves with protective clothing and items, others felt that this meant they were prepared for violence and vandalism. Protester Chris Smith did not wear a helmet or carry anything that could be construed as a weapon, as she felt that if she did, it would be perceived by police and Tour supporters that she was intent on violence, which was not the case.<sup>593</sup> She joined the marches because she was demonstrating against apartheid and therefore she was never going to put herself in a position where she would be involved in anything illegal or dangerous.<sup>594</sup> For the majority, protective clothing was a preventive measure which was used to stop injuries if the march became violent. This was the case for protester Nick Parker, who did not want to be involved in any violence; however, after what had happened in Hamilton and in Molesworth Street, he knew that things could turn violent.<sup>595</sup> He therefore wore a motorcycle helmet as a precaution.<sup>596</sup> Protective

---

<sup>591</sup> Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016.

<sup>592</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>593</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>594</sup> Smith, [interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>595</sup> Nick Parker, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 8 September 2016.

<sup>596</sup> Parker, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 8 September 2016.

clothing, was not in most instances, an armour that was worn so that protesters could intentionally enter into a confrontation with police.

Protesters' resolve was also hardened following Molesworth Street as, rather than scaring people away from demonstrating, protesters became more determined to stop games from being played. Barrowman writes that "[i]f Molesworth Street was intended to intimidate protesters off the streets, it failed on that count. Far from frightening people away, Molesworth Street strengthened and crystallized the determination of protesters ... the depth of anti-Tour feelings, and put a lot of people on the streets who might otherwise not have been there."<sup>597</sup> For Leon Eccersall there was a visible shift in tactics, atmosphere, and resolve at marches and protests following Molesworth Street. Prior to July 29, Leon described protest events as being akin to a "casual Sunday walk," where it was the job of the police to simply escort them to where they wanted to be.<sup>598</sup> However, after Molesworth Street, the police were suddenly having to block off roads, put up barriers, and fortify rugby grounds with barbed wire and bins. As a result of this change in protest tactics, police tactics had to be altered. Leon remembers that at the start there was a "period of negotiation," where both parties were able to come to some form of compromise, however it progressed to the point where police had to be more forceful and tell protesters what to do.<sup>599</sup> According to Leon there "was just a real staunch line in the sand and ... that was not to be crossed."<sup>600</sup> By the time the Tour arrived in Christchurch for the first test match, police and protesters were prepared to do all that was necessary to either ensure the Tour went ahead, or to stop the game from being played.

---

<sup>597</sup> Barrowman, 'A Report of the Molesworth Street Incident,' 47.

<sup>598</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>599</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>600</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.



Figure 3. Photograph taken by Allan Cumming of protest marshals forming a barrier between police and demonstrators in Dunedin on 11 August 1981. Brent Burnett-Jones (forefront of photograph) is wearing his motorcycle helmet, gloves, and shoulder pads for protection.

[Source: Allan Cumming, in Tom Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire: A response to the 1981 Springbok Tour of New Zealand*, (Auckland: Real Pictures, 1981), 42.]

### August 15 – the First Test Match

The first test match of the Tour between the All Blacks and Springboks was held on August 15 at Lancaster Park in Christchurch. According to Geoff Chapple, the atmosphere in Christchurch underwent a considerable change in the days leading up to the test.<sup>601</sup> There was a palpable tension hanging over the city as the test drew closer and preparations by both protesters and police were significantly increased. The events at Hamilton and Molesworth Street meant that demonstrations on the day of the test would not be passive and as a result they would be met with active resistance by police to ensure the test match was played without interruptions.

---

<sup>601</sup> Chapple, 1981, 186.

For HART and other anti-apartheid organisations there was the need to make a firm statement as this was the first test match of the series. The eyes of New Zealand, South Africa, and the rest of the world would be on Lancaster Park and it was therefore necessary to make an impact. Planning for August 15 began in the weeks prior and included activities such as organising protest marshals, speakers, a first aid team, and banners.<sup>602</sup> Tickets were also bought for the game so that protesters would be able to get into the grounds and take action from there.<sup>603</sup> According to Marion Hobbs, HART's focus was not only on the game, instead demonstrations would also target the Springboks' arrival in Christchurch, their practices, and their accommodation.<sup>604</sup> By not solely focusing on the game it was hoped that a "head-on confrontation" with police and the Escort Groups, an elite police squad whose main job was to protect the Springboks, would be avoided.<sup>605</sup> This was in keeping with HART's policy of non-violent direct action.<sup>606</sup> HART wanted to stop the test, but it was hoped actions such as storming police lines would not be necessary.<sup>607</sup>

The plan for protesters on August 15 had been carefully arranged and co-ordinated in the lead up to the game. The route that the march would take had been negotiated by HART and the police to ensure that protesters were able to get their message across without risk of injury or confrontation with rugby fans.<sup>608</sup> The march was supposed to move from Cathedral Square, along Colombo and High Streets and then onto Ferry Road, where the group would stop once they reached the Lancaster Street intersection.<sup>609</sup> The demonstration would therefore be within 250 metres of the main entrance to Lancaster Park, which was close enough to make their presence known, whilst also maintaining a safe distance for all concerned.<sup>610</sup> The police feared that if protesters were able to get any closer to

---

<sup>602</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 69.

<sup>603</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 69.

<sup>604</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archives no. 75-113563,' Springbok Rugby Tour Papers, University of Canterbury, 198, accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

<sup>605</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archives no. 75-113563.'

<sup>606</sup> Chapple, 1981, 188.

<sup>607</sup> Chapple, 1981, 188.

<sup>608</sup> Chapple, 1981, 194.

<sup>609</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 45.

<sup>610</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 45.

Lancaster Park then they might attempt to breach police defences. This would not only put the game at risk, if the protesters successfully made it onto the field, but it also put protesters in danger of confrontations with police and rugby fans. The police had given HART assurances that the march would be able to come close enough to the grounds, but that a safe distance still needed to be maintained.<sup>611</sup> This plan was therefore in line with HART's policy of non-violent action because if demonstrators adhered to the agreed upon route then it was unlikely that any confrontations between police, protesters, and Tour supporters would occur. Despite this agreement on the march route though, HART had devised their own plan for the demonstration, as it was their main priority to ensure that the game was cancelled.<sup>612</sup> Protest organisers were also hesitant to trust that the police would keep their assurance of allowing the march to get as close as possible to Lancaster Park. This distrust was not unwarranted as in New Plymouth and Dunedin, the police had stopped protesters from taking pre-arranged routes.<sup>613</sup> It was hoped though that confrontations would be kept to a minimum despite the change in plans.

Very few people knew exactly what the new route was. This was to ensure that the new plan was not leaked to the police, as in the past undercover police had attended HART meetings to gather intelligence.<sup>614</sup> Originally there were three groups, however a fourth was added at a later stage.<sup>615</sup> The first group was known as the 'inside "inside" group' and their aim was to gain entry to Lancaster Park and attempt to bring down one of the goal posts with rope.<sup>616</sup> This act had been practised successfully beforehand. The next group was the 'inside "support" group' whose job it was to divert police attention from those who were attempting to damage the goal posts.<sup>617</sup> This was the group that was added later on. The third group was the 'assault group', who would be at the front of the main march

---

<sup>611</sup> Chapple, 1981, 194.

<sup>612</sup> Chapple, 1981, 194.

<sup>613</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>614</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive, no. 71-113559,' and Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 74.

<sup>615</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 75-113563.'

<sup>616</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 75-113563.'

<sup>617</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 75-113563.'

outside Lancaster Park.<sup>618</sup> This group would break away from the main march on a pre-arranged signal and attempt to gain entry to Lancaster Park through the No.2 Practice Ground.<sup>619</sup> It was hoped that by breaking away early, rather than following the pre-arranged route to the main entrance of the park, that protesters would be able to gain access through the less heavily guarded and fortified No.2 Practice Ground. The final group was comprised of the 'main march' and their aim was to get as many people as close as possible to the grounds.<sup>620</sup> Although meticulously planned and practised, the protesters were not successful in achieving all of their aims, nor their overall goal of stopping the test match from being played.

Behind a banner which read "Please Stop the Tour" marched approximately 6,000 men and women towards Lancaster Park.<sup>621</sup> The group followed the pre-arranged route which had been decided upon by HART and the police from Cathedral Square until they reached the intersection of Ferry Road and Barbadoes Street.<sup>622</sup> However, instead of continuing down Ferry Road, the marshals, at the front of the group, led the march along Barbadoes Street and toward the Waltham Road overbridge.<sup>623</sup> Just before the group reached the overbridge, small slips of paper were passed from those in the front lines towards the back of the march. They read:

*This is a peaceful march. Some direct action may take place. If you do not wish to be involved please move towards the back of the march. Please pass this card on.*<sup>624</sup>

It also became clear that the first ten lines of the group were going to break off early and go in a different direction, while the main march would proceed over the overbridge, along Mowbray Street, and eventually turn up Wilsons Road.<sup>625</sup> They would then proceed to the main entrance of Lancaster

---

<sup>618</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 75-113563.'

<sup>619</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 75-113563.'

<sup>620</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 75-113563.'

<sup>621</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 45.

<sup>622</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 45.

<sup>623</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 45.

<sup>624</sup> Chapple, 1981, 194.

<sup>625</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 75-113563.'

Park where a sit-in would be held.<sup>626</sup> Chris Smith recalls the moment when protesters began to move within the group, those who wanted to be involved in direct action went to the front few rows, while those who wanted to remain as peaceful as possible moved further back. Chris did not join those at the front, although some of her friends did. Her reason for not going forward was that those who did appeared ready to get into a confrontation; “I saw how they came with aggro and that wasn’t me.”<sup>627</sup> Christine Beardsley and Brent Burnett-Jones did join those at the front of the group.

I did feel anxiety, [but] I was really pumped up really in the sense of, not out there to fight or anything, but I was really tense and I’m sure there was heaps of adrenaline pumping around and when we got near the Waltham overbridge and I was near the front and there were lots of people I knew. We definitely didn’t have the kids then, we must have got a baby sitter cause my ex-husband was there that day too. The decision was [that] some people will go down the railway tracks sort of to get to Lancaster Park quickly and other people, most of the people, would take the route around the road. So, I split off with the people going down the railway track and I think I was really wired actually. **Christine Beardsley.**<sup>628</sup>

Another message was passed to those in the first few rows telling them that on the whistle blasts they were to head for the coal yards.<sup>629</sup> The plan for this group was to run through the railway yards on the left side of the overbridge and through into the back of the coal yard. The front of the coal yard was enclosed by a wooden fence that could be easily pushed through, with the protesters then arriving in Lismore Street.<sup>630</sup> This would bring the protesters to the corrugated iron fence that ran along the back of Lancaster Park’s No.2 Practice Ground. It was hoped that by making it through the fence and into

---

<sup>626</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 78.

<sup>627</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>628</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>629</sup> Chapple, 1981, 195.

<sup>630</sup> Chapple, 1981, 195.

the No.2 Practice Ground some protesters might be able to join those inside Lancaster Park.<sup>631</sup> Brent recalls the moment that the first ten rows set off running at the sound of the whistle.

All of a sudden, the first lot, and I'm with them, just take off running, up the motorway, up the overbridge, while the rest go straight, then we came down and round and from then, as someone described it as cat and mouse with the police, we went through the coal yard from memory and ended up in Wilsons Road.<sup>632</sup>

The police, who had been escorting the march, were taken by surprise at the 'assault groups' sudden departure from the main march and were thus unable to stop the protesters as they ran through the railway yard.<sup>633</sup> However, reinforcements, in the form of the Red Squad, soon made their way down Lismore Street, at the back of Lancaster Park, in an attempt to corner the protesters in the coal and railway yards.<sup>634</sup> Christine remembers the terror that she felt as the Red Squad chased protesters through the industrial area.

At one stage, some of the Red Squad were running behind us and I just took off, but [with] my stupid tramping boots on I could not sprint like I usually did, but I remember getting to a paling fence and just being so terrified ... the paling fence wasn't brand new but it wasn't dilapidated either but I do remember ripping some palings off and getting through the fence. It staggered me afterwards and I thought, oh I have read about people doing things that they thought they'd never do physically, and I think that was the day for me.<sup>635</sup>

Christine's act of pulling off the fence palings could be classed as an act of vandalism. However, it is important to take into account the context of Christine's actions. She did not intentionally set about to destroy or damage the fence, rather she saw it as a last resort in order to escape members of the Red Squad. If Christine had not perceived herself to be in immediate danger it is more than likely that

---

<sup>631</sup> Chapple, 1981, 195.

<sup>632</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>633</sup> Chapple, 1981, 197.

<sup>634</sup> Chapple, 1981, 198.

<sup>635</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.



she would not have acted as she did. Christine's act was in response to an imminent threat, she did not have time to decide if the act would be against the law rather, she had to respond immediately to what was happening around her. In many instances, the context surrounding particular events appears to be forgotten. Rather, it is simply seen as an act of vandalism instead of an action done as a result of desperation and terror.

Likewise, Christine also acted in a manner which could have been perceived to be violent when attempting to stop an acquaintance from being hurt by a police officer.

Somehow, I was seemingly by myself, I mean there were people sort of around, but it wasn't a big group of us and seeing somebody that I knew getting beaten up [by] a policeman just over the fence and I remember picking up coal, lumps of it, you know and throwing it over the fence at this policeman, which I never would've believed I would've done. I was [a] very law-abiding person, but I just thought I've got to do something this man's getting horribly beaten and I was trying to distract the policeman. So, it was a shocking day in that way.<sup>636</sup>

If anyone had witnessed Christine throwing lumps of coal at the police officer, or if they had heard about it later on without knowing the reasons why Christine acted in this way then she would probably be perceived to be a protester who was intent on violence. However, Christine's actions need to be taken into context. She did not set out to injure anyone that day and she did not go looking to start an altercation with police without being provoked. Rather, she was attempting to distract the police officer in order to stop a fellow protester from being injured. It is important to understand the background and context of a situation before conclusions can be made about what is happening and why. Christine agrees that within the history books and the media reports from the time, actions such as hers were taken out of context.

---

<sup>636</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

The context was so important and a context at times which was completely unexpected. I didn't know beforehand, I had nothing planned except this idea of not getting smashed in the face with my plastic arm guards.<sup>637</sup>

The actions taken by some protesters in an attempt to stop the first test match being played were not sanctioned or condoned by HART. One such action which, according to Chapple, had been devised with the knowledge or approval of HART was the throwing of sharp objects on to the field at Lancaster Park.<sup>638</sup> It is highly unlikely that HART would have allowed the plan to go ahead, as it went against their policy of non-violent direct action.

Those who had managed to purchase tickets to the test match were part of the 'inside "inside" group' who would attempt to stop the game from being played by damaging one of the goal posts.<sup>639</sup> As a result of police intelligence though, a number of protesters were recognised at the gates and were not allowed to enter Lancaster Park.<sup>640</sup> This decreased the number of protesters who would be able to damage the goal posts and distract the police thus making their aim more difficult to achieve.

The protesters were set to run onto the field just before the game began, however those that had managed to make it into the grounds became increasingly worried that they had been discovered by police. With ten minutes to go before kick-off, Jim Graham, made the decision to give the signal early for the protesters to run onto the field.<sup>641</sup> He had been spooked by three police squad men who were pointing in the direction of the demonstrators.<sup>642</sup> Jim gave the signal of 'Amandla' and 100 people proceeded to break over the fence around the embankment and attempted to make it onto the field.<sup>643</sup> Approximately 17 people gathered in the middle of the field, in a tight circle facing outwards

---

<sup>637</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>638</sup> Chapple, 1981, 193.

<sup>639</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 75-113563.'

<sup>640</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 75-113563.'

<sup>641</sup> Chapple, 1981, 206.

<sup>642</sup> Chapple, 1981, 206.

<sup>643</sup> Chapple, 1981, 208.

toward the crowd of 40,000 and approaching members of the Red Squad.<sup>644</sup> Before being forcibly escorted from the ground, a number of those, who had made it onto the field, attempted to delay the game further by dropping tennis balls which contained fish hooks, broken glass and tacks, onto the field.<sup>645</sup> Those participants who protested against the Tour believed that tactics, such as the tennis balls, which could hurt people, went too far.

The objective was to stop the match, I appreciate that, but you're also risking personal injury of people. I can quite cynically say well if a Springbok or an All Black is playing and gets injured I'm not really concerned, [but] can you guarantee that you'll get every piece of that off for the next game which is maybe a friendly between two kids teams. No I didn't agree with that, fortunately I didn't know anybody who was doing that. **Brent Burnett-Jones.**<sup>646</sup>

Yeah that's silly, as a health professional I guess I have to say that, but no the group that I was in, it was peaceful disobedience and we weren't out to hurt people. **Debbie Osborn.**<sup>647</sup>

Tactics such as this were therefore seen as irresponsible when the long-term effect of them was unknown. There were more effective ways to stop games and get the message across without resorting to tactics that could deliberately cause someone harm.

These actions should not be considered representative of the entire anti-apartheid movement as not all protesters committed acts of violence or vandalism. William Anderson believes that there is a "spectrum of activities in any protest" and these activities are not necessarily supported or carried out by all of those involved in the movement.<sup>648</sup> All participants who opposed the Tour agreed that actions such as the bomb at Christchurch Airport and the tacks and glass on the field at Lancaster Park, were wrong. For participants, tactics which could lead to injury went too far and were not an effective way

---

<sup>644</sup> Chapple, 1981, 208.

<sup>645</sup> Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016.

<sup>646</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>647</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>648</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

for the anti-apartheid movement to convey their message.<sup>649</sup> Christine Beardsley felt that any tactics which could injure or kill someone went against what the anti-apartheid movement was trying to stop and she certainly would not have been involved in any such activities herself.<sup>650</sup>

From the participants' views on the use of such violent tactics it can be ascertained that the main body of demonstrators did not feel that the use of violence was an appropriate action to use in order stop the Tour from continuing.<sup>651</sup> Rather, participants believed that there were better ways to get their message across and to stop the Tour.<sup>652</sup> It is however, difficult to make any steadfast conclusions in regards to the use of violence and who was using it due to the fact that the participants of this study did not use violent tactics themselves. Nevertheless, they did acknowledge that some demonstrators were intent on using violence and that a small number of them did commit violent acts.<sup>653</sup>

Actions that were considered violent, such as the bomb at Christchurch Airport, were not necessarily committed by anti-apartheid demonstrators and if they were, generally it was not the main body of demonstrators who resorted to violence.<sup>654</sup> Throughout the Tour, anti-apartheid organisations maintained that all actions and tactics were not violent, with Tom Newnham of CARE stating that out of 150,000 protesters nationwide only the "tiniest number" committed acts of violence.<sup>655</sup> Anti-apartheid demonstrators have also maintained that it was not the main body of protesters who were

---

<sup>649</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016; Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016; Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016; Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016; Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016, and Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>650</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>651</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016; Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016; Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016; Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016; Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016; Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>652</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016; Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016; Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016; Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016; Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016; Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016; Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>653</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016; Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016, and Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>654</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>655</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 11.

violent, but rather violence was used by smaller, radical groups.<sup>656</sup> According to Leon Eccersall, there were radical, splinter groups who did resort to violence and he believes that acts of civil disobedience were taken to the “extreme” by some protesters.<sup>657</sup>

It is clear that violence and vandalism were not condoned by a large number of anti-apartheid demonstrators nor anti-apartheid organisations. HART did not condone acts of violence and insisted on a policy of non-violent civil disobedience throughout the Tour. Violent acts did occur as the Tour progressed and people became frustrated that the games continued to be played. These actions were primarily perpetrated by a few individuals who were looking to cause trouble or used the opportunity that the Tour presented, to get into confrontations with police. When looking at the large numbers that opposed the Tour, the violent actions of these radical individuals should not be considered to be representative of the entire anti-apartheid movement.

---

<sup>656</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016; Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016; Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016; Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016; Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016, and Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>657</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

## **Chapter Four: Day 28 – The question of police brutality**

The actions of police during the Tour have been questioned by some anti-apartheid demonstrators in regards to their use of force to control protesters. Many demonstrators believed that police used force excessively to ensure that games were not interrupted by the actions of those who did not want the Tour to proceed. This belief became increasingly prevalent as the Tour continued as both police and protest tactics evolved in response to the actions of each other. The popular perception therefore exists amongst anti-apartheid demonstrators that all police used force excessively to the point where acts of outright police brutality occurred. This chapter takes a case study approach by focusing on the actions and perspectives of study participant, Leon Eccersall, who was a Police Constable in Christchurch during the Tour. It is Leon's oral history interview which guides this chapter and therefore his perspectives on the use of excessive force during the Tour are central to what this chapter argues. Throughout the chapter, Leon's perspective is compared to other available personal testimony from police officers who were in charge of maintaining law and order during the Tour. The perspectives of other study participants are also used in order to discuss whether excessive force was used. From Leon's perspective on the use of force, as well as the views of other participants, this chapter argues that not all police used excessive force to ensure that rugby games were played. Instead, Leon believes that force was only used when absolutely necessary and was primarily used in order to keep all those involved, both protesters and rugby supporters, safe. It should be noted though that Leon's views are not representative of the entire New Zealand Police Force during the Tour. Instead, Leon's perspectives on events are his own. He cannot speak for other police personnel and therefore does not comment on the possible use of force by other officers. Rather, Leon provides the perspective and attitude of one police officer during the Tour.

The first part of this chapter discusses the belief by anti-apartheid demonstrators that all police used excessive force to ensure that the Tour was able to proceed. The events in Hamilton and in Molesworth Street, in Wellington, are explored with regards to the change in police tactics, which

occurred as a result of these two events. The thoughts of anti-apartheid demonstrators, with regards to the use of force by police, are then analysed in order to gauge whether this study's participants believed that excessive force was used during the Tour. Leon's own thoughts on police brutality are then discussed.

The second part of this chapter explores the role of police during the Tour and the position in which they were placed when directed to ensure that the legal rights of all those involved were upheld. It is argued here that when force was used to control protesters it was done in an attempt to protect them from potentially more violent confrontations with Tour supporters. The police and riot squads in Christchurch are then discussed with regards to accusations of police brutality from anti-apartheid demonstrators. The views of Tour supporters are also outlined to illustrate how the other side of the Tour debate viewed the police at the time.

The final section of this chapter analyses the ways in which police were affected as a result of their role in the Tour. Police personnel suffered from severe stress due to the confrontations between themselves and protesters. The belief that all police were guilty of police brutality also took a toll on officers. According to former Police Officer Barry Nalder, who helped to train the Red and Blue Squads, the police were put into a no-win situation.<sup>658</sup>

### Public Perception and the Myth of Police Brutality

*"What we hadn't expected was the brutal and vicious reaction of the police towards us. We were aware that we would confront the Red or Blue Squads of police, but we were never prepared for their actions that afternoon. Batoning, punching, kicking – they tried their hardest to expel us from the field. We had all been ready and willing to be arrested, but not assaulted."*

**Juliet Morris.**<sup>659</sup>

---

<sup>658</sup> Barry Nalder, [questionnaire], Whangarei, 1 September 2016.

<sup>659</sup> Morris, *With All Our strength*, 79.

The belief exists, amongst anti-apartheid demonstrators, that police used excessive force during the Tour to ensure that games were not interrupted by the actions of protesters.<sup>660</sup> Anti-apartheid demonstrators believed that police used force to stop them from breaking through police lines so that the Tour could proceed.<sup>661</sup> If protesters had been able to break through police defences then games would have been cancelled and the anti-apartheid movement would have achieved their primary aims. The belief that excessive force was used to control protesters became widespread following the events in Hamilton and Molesworth Street.

Following the cancellation of the Hamilton game on July 25 police were accused by Tour supporters of not having done enough to stop protesters from getting onto the field at Rugby Park.<sup>662</sup> Rugby fans were deeply angry, both at demonstrators for their actions, and at the police for allowing protesters to stop the game. Michael Ward recalls watching the Hamilton game on television:

The Hamilton debacle where they ran onto the ground there and stopped the game, I just felt totally gutted. I couldn't understand how that could happen, how they could let that even happen.<sup>663</sup>

That evening a press conference was held by Police Commissioner Bob Walton where he clarified why the game had been abandoned. Walton explained that there had been a risk to public safety, most notably from the plane flown by Pat McQuarie.<sup>664</sup> McQuarie had threatened to fly a plane into a grandstand during a rugby game if the Tour was not cancelled.<sup>665</sup> On the day of the Hamilton game, McQuarie stole a plane from Taupo and flew toward Rugby Park.<sup>666</sup> Upon hearing that protesters had made it onto the field, McQuarie diverted the plane to the Morrinsville race track where he was

---

<sup>660</sup> Morris, *With All Our strength*, 63.

<sup>661</sup> Morris, *With All Our strength*, 62.

<sup>662</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>663</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>664</sup> Shears and Gidley, *Storm out of Africa!*, 51.

<sup>665</sup> Shears and Gidley, *Storm out of Africa!*, 40.

<sup>666</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 30.



subsequently arrested.<sup>667</sup> Furthermore, Walton defended the decision of the police to not use extreme force to remove protesters from the field, as he believed that this would have led to more violence.<sup>668</sup> According to Richard Shears and Isobelle Gidley, a number of police personnel were frustrated that they had not been able to use force to shift protesters from the field and that more should have been done to prevent the protesters from entering Rugby Park.<sup>669</sup> The inability to use force to remove protesters also challenged the dominant notions of masculinity that existed within the New Zealand Police at the time. The police, saw themselves and were seen by the public as the macho enforcers of New Zealand law. However, after the Hamilton game, some police felt that they suffered a “loss of face” at being unable to use force to remove protesters from the field.<sup>670</sup> Some police believed that this would affect the image of the New Zealand Police as it could undermine the public’s confidence in them to ensure that law and order was maintained throughout the Tour.<sup>671</sup> Police personnel also believed that the success of the protesters in ensuring the game was abandoned, would encourage them to continue with such tactics. According to Louise Greig, “there was only one way to recover these losses, and that was to publicly regain control of the situation just as they had publicly lost it.”<sup>672</sup> In order to do this, police numbers were increased and tactics were revised.

The incident on Molesworth Street in Wellington on July 29 was seen as the turning point in the Tour with regards to the use of tactics that would be used by police and protesters thereafter. The change in protest tactics as a result of the Molesworth Street incident have previously been discussed in Chapter Three. The actions of police that night though needs further analysis.

There were claims from anti-apartheid organisations that police used excessive force during the Molesworth Street incident in order to reassert their control and authority, after the embarrassment

---

<sup>667</sup> Shears and Gidley, *Storm out of Africa!*, 47.

<sup>668</sup> Shears and Gidley, *Storm out of Africa!*, 51.

<sup>669</sup> Shears and Gidley, *Storm out of Africa!*, 52.

<sup>670</sup> Louise Greig, ‘The Police and the Tour,’ *The Police and the 1981 Tour*, ed. by Malcolm McKinnon, Peter McPhee, and Jock Phillips, (Wellington: Victoria University History Department, 1985), 13.

<sup>671</sup> Shears and Gidley, *Storm out of Africa!*, 52.

<sup>672</sup> Greig, ‘The Police and the Tour,’ 13.

of the cancelled Hamilton game, where they were accused of not having done enough.<sup>673</sup> According to Rachel Barrowman this was a correct assessment of the situation. Barrowman believes that, to some extent, police did plan what was to happen in Molesworth Street.

*“Not necessarily planned in any precise military fashion, but the police had planned to make a stand that night, and to make a stand using batons if necessary. The protesters were never going to have been allowed any further up Molesworth Street than they got.”*<sup>674</sup>

Barrowman believes that what occurred in Molesworth Street happened because of the cancellation of the game in Hamilton. Following the events in Hamilton, police morale was at an all-time low, with many officers feeling disappointed and disgusted at not being able to stop the protesters from forcing the cancellation of the game.<sup>675</sup> By reasserting control over protesters in Wellington, police were able to regain control over the entire Tour situation. Deputy Chief Inspector Peter Faulkner explained that, “we were not going to allow a situation to develop where we lose control and mob rule might take over.”<sup>676</sup>

The use of batons by police in Molesworth Street was seen as an excessive use of force and an act of police brutality by anti-apartheid demonstrators.<sup>677</sup> Protesters questioned whether batons had been necessary to control the situation or whether other, less forceful tactics, would have been just as effective.<sup>678</sup> For the remainder of the Tour, police were constantly under scrutiny with regard to the types of tactics that were used to control protests and ensure that games were played.

Following the Molesworth Street incident police were required to change their tactics in response to the change in protest tactics. As discussed in Chapter Three, protest tactics changed following the

---

<sup>673</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 39.

<sup>674</sup> Barrowman, ‘A Report on the Molesworth Street Incident,’ 39.

<sup>675</sup> Barrowman, ‘A Report on the Molesworth Street Incident,’ 29.

<sup>676</sup> *Evening Post*, 30 July 1981, in Rachel Barrowman, ‘A Report on the Molesworth Street Incident,’ *The Police and the 1981 Tour*, ed. by Malcolm McKinnon, Peter McPhee, and Jock Phillips, (Wellington: Victoria University History Department, 1985), 40.

<sup>677</sup> Chapple, 1981, 146; Shears and Gidley, *Storm out of Africa!*, 67, and Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 39.

<sup>678</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 39.

Molesworth Street incident, because protesters were responding the use of batons by police. Protective clothing began to be worn and protesters became even more staunch and determined to interrupt games.<sup>679</sup> Protesters also wanted to continue with the strategies that had been implemented in Hamilton as these actions had ensured the cancellation of the game, which was the primary goal for protesters once the Tour began.<sup>680</sup> In order to stop rugby games from being played protesters had to make their way through police lines and onto the rugby field. However, it was the role of the police to ensure that this did not happen. Police therefore had to adopt new strategies so that games were not at risk of being cancelled. These tactics included the use of the new long baton, which was designed to be thrust forward from the waist, rather than used around the head like the older short baton.<sup>681</sup> Police numbers were also increased and police lines were told not to move or give.<sup>682</sup> Following the implementation of these new strategies police were consistently accused of over-reacting when attempting to stop protesters from getting through police lines.<sup>683</sup> This over-reaction was primarily in the form of excessive and unnecessary force or outright police brutality. Those interviewed, who opposed the Tour, had not personally experienced or witnessed any police brutality, however they had second-hand knowledge, that excessive force was used by police on some occasions, by hearing about it from other people.<sup>684</sup> They also saw the aftermath of possible police brutality, particularly on the day of the Christchurch test match, when they came across people they knew who were quite badly injured at the hands of the police.<sup>685</sup> Below are excerpts from interviews when police tactics and police brutality were discussed:

---

<sup>679</sup> Barrowman, 'A Report of the Molesworth Street Incident,' 46.

<sup>680</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no.75-113563.'

<sup>681</sup> '1981 Tour Special,' *Close Up*, TVNZ, 4 July 2006, [television program].

<sup>682</sup> '1981 Tour Special,' *Close Up*.

<sup>683</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 18-113508,' Springbok Rugby Tour Papers, University of Canterbury, 1981, accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

<sup>684</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>685</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016, and Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

Most of the Tour marches in Christchurch, leaving aside the test, the police were low key. If someone was gonna be arrested they were arrested, but it wasn't violence, batons being swung. There might've been something going on in the background and I didn't know, but everything I saw, it was low key. When I was arrested, when everybody was arrested there, it was walk up take my arms, you know I either had [the] choice of standing up or they'd lift me and I stood up, other people went limp and were lifted, and walked away – no violence. The day of the [match] it changed, people got injured. Bill, as I said, got his face smashed and he wasn't a violent man, you can't claim in any way shape or form he was doing something violent. The entire time I knew him I never heard him raise his voice. He was in the front-rank, I was, by that stage, about three ranks back cause we'd all disorganised and we stopped and the cops walked forward and kept walking. They used what they called rapid action, which [was] where they brought the baton up and just went bang bang bang bang bang across your face, your body, and he got hit, he got hit badly. **Brent Burnett-Jones.**<sup>686</sup>

I remember seeing my ex-husband vomiting in the gutter, he'd got kicked in the genitals by a policeman and another elderly man that I knew had got hit on the face and I came across him and he was really bloodied in the face so, it was about helping people at the time too. A friend of mine, later I discovered, a female she was at university and she'd got a whole lot of her teeth hit out. I had another friend and she was female, who was another university student, had some Red Squad members come into her flat and they beat her up badly, you know, she got some damage to her face and I think there's a hand or arm that never repaired and some brain damage, which over time repaired itself. But you know she was in her flat by herself. I was just aghast, so it did impact on my trust of the police and I think I've always been cautious about that I mean, but I certainly didn't think they're all bastards or anything like that and I think a police force is a necessary thing to have, but it needs to be well trained and hopefully

---

<sup>686</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

not used as a force against people in a violent way. I actually, in my involvement at that time I never saw the police hit first. I saw them stand there in their riot gear, but I personally didn't see them hit first. I thought they were scared, a lot of them, I really did. **Christine Beardsley.**<sup>687</sup>

[I] heard about I think it was one of the Lancaster Park games, I think the gasworks down Ferry Road must've been still around and I think there was a fair amount of violence, breaking down fences and then the police got really pissed off, probably with the protesters at that point, that was one of the games that I was at the marae, but I didn't see it, but I heard about it. The only thing I saw were police pulling us off the street, you know, and that become a bit more forceful, especially if there are a lot of us, you know, if they had to arrest a hundred people or whatever then, you know, they had to push us out of the way to get to the next one. **Debbie Osborn.**<sup>688</sup>

It is difficult to gauge whether police brutality or excessive force from police was a common occurrence during the Tour. This is due to the fact that no participants actually experienced or witnessed any occurring themselves. The injuries and events, as described by participants, happened to other people and therefore the context of these events is unknown. It is therefore difficult to make conclusions about whether these were incidents of police brutality or whether there were other factors, such as a protester taunting the police or acting violently first, that occurred and therefore need to be considered. Personal testimony sent to the University of Canterbury following the Tour shows that, at times, police did use violence in a way that could be described as excessive:

The police officer then turned on me and by grabbing the back of my neck and pulling my hair hurled me away from the other people. Two other officers then grabbed my arms and started to thrust them behind my back. I was forced down on the ground and while one officer kneeled on my head, two others twisted my arms behind my back and clamped steel manacles

---

<sup>687</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>688</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

on my wrists. These handcuffs were closed so tightly that the circulation was cut off from my hands.<sup>689</sup>

Prominent individuals, such as Trevor Richards, who has written about the Tour, believes that excessive force was used in order to control demonstrations.<sup>690</sup> However, Leon believes that it is pertinent that the context of events is understood before actions are labelled as police brutality.<sup>691</sup> His responses to accusations of police brutality are below:

How do you gauge excessive force, you've gotta look at the event at the time and it wasn't a case of if somebody was down, say a protester, they didn't suddenly have six other cops beating up on them or kicking them or anything like that. I don't know if anything was ever recorded like that, sure as heck I never witnessed it. I'm not saying it was all fair, cause at times one person might've received a couple of baton strikes from somebody to stop them, you know, it wasn't a case of just lining up an individual in front of you, it was just a case of dealing with the masses and just getting them back.<sup>692</sup>

When [arresting someone] it's a very tough process, like when all these emotions are going on both sides with a person who doesn't want to get arrested, who's broken a law somewhere or for whatever reason is being arrested, it can look pretty damn nasty at times and some of them didn't come out of it too well. You know what you see on TV is just so distant to what real life offers you out there. It's not a case of politely asking somebody, it's not a case of placing, most times, it's not a case of placing a simple restraint on a person, if they're gonna kick up bobsy-die, you know, at times it might take four people to hold that one person and it will hurt that person and if they are gonna be non-compliant it's gonna hurt them further.

Some people would say acts of brutality – it was just force, controlling what you had to do.<sup>693</sup>

---

<sup>689</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 70-113558.'

<sup>690</sup> Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*, 223.

<sup>691</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>692</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>693</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

In regards to Leon's experience as a Police Constable during the Tour, the context of events was incredibly important; otherwise assumptions were made as to what had happened and whether the police were to blame.

I got sent round to the public hospital, a young lady there, she was going to the match she wanted to see the match, but on the way she was beaten up by a group of protesters so they sent my off-sider and I round to the hospital to see her, see how she was. She had been dealt to and we were there with her and this was the time when the first injured parties were coming back from Wilsons Road. The protester group they saw us in here with this girl that was bleeding and the assumption [was] that we'd beaten her up and so we got the full-monty from these people and I know we're trying to help this poor girl. **Leon Eccersall.**<sup>694</sup>

It was perceived by protesters that Leon was guilty of beating a woman in an unprovoked attack. This was not the case though, as it had instead been protesters who were responsible for the woman's injuries. Taking this event out of context fuelled the perception that officers were guilty of police brutality and in many instances, had used batons, and other forceful tactics, when they were not necessary.

#### 'I will see and cause Her Majesty's peace to be kept and preserved'

The primary role of the police during the Tour was the 'protection of life and property' and to maintain law and order.<sup>695</sup> Former Police Constable Leon took this duty very seriously, as this was what he had sworn to do when he took his oath in 1976:

A part of that oath was to uphold or keep the Queen's peace, amongst other things, and I was sworn to do that, that was my duty [and] so I was proud to do that.<sup>696</sup>

---

<sup>694</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>695</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 18-113508.'

<sup>696</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

Police were expected to protect the rights of all those involved during the Tour. They were obliged to protect the Springboks who were legally allowed to be in New Zealand and play rugby.<sup>697</sup> Likewise, the police had to acknowledge that people did not want them here and it was their right to protest against the Tour taking place, as long as the methods employed to show their opposition did not break the law.<sup>698</sup> Furthermore, it was the responsibility of the police to ensure that those who wanted to watch a game of rugby were able to do so, as this was their legal right.<sup>699</sup> The police were therefore required to protect the rights of law-abiding citizens from those who chose to break the law in an attempt to disrupt a game of rugby. This was the role of police during the Tour, they were told where to go and what to do regardless of how they felt personally about the Springboks playing in New Zealand.

According to one Christchurch police officer, a survey was conducted within the Police Department prior to the commencement of the Tour. This survey showed that 100% of police staff were opposed to South Africa's apartheid policy and that 73% did not want the Springboks to tour New Zealand.<sup>700</sup> Many officers were hesitant about the Tour taking place because of the disruption it could cause to New Zealand society.<sup>701</sup> Despite these personal feelings towards the Tour, police personnel had a job to do. Personal views and opinions were therefore pushed aside so that they did not affect an officer's ability to do their job.<sup>702</sup> As a rugby fan, Leon wanted the Tour to go ahead, nevertheless he was worried about the damage that it could do to New Zealand society and he did not want to be involved in confrontations with the public.<sup>703</sup> However, Leon knew that it was his job to ensure the Tour proceeded:

---

<sup>697</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 18-113508.'

<sup>698</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 18-113508.'

<sup>699</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 18-113508.'

<sup>700</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 18-113508.'

<sup>701</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 32(I)-113483.'

<sup>702</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>703</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.



It just comes down to being a sworn police officer and I knew what I had to do and that was going to be it. It came down to a very black and white scenario for me and that was it.<sup>704</sup>

Barry Nalder believes that the police were placed in a no-win situation.<sup>705</sup> They had to protect the Springboks and rugby fans to ensure that their legal rights were upheld, whilst also protecting protesters who were attempting to get through police lines. They were firmly stuck in the middle of New Zealand's Tour controversy.

According to Leon, in Christchurch, there was the real fear that someone would be killed or seriously injured. Leon believed that if the test match was abandoned or if protesters got into Lancaster Park and attempted to stop the game in some way then there would be violent confrontations between protesters and Tour supporters.<sup>706</sup> This was due to the fact that many rugby supporters were incredibly passionate and they would do almost anything to watch a game of rugby, including injuring those who tried to stop it.<sup>707</sup> It was therefore the job of the police to ensure that protesters were protected from rugby fans and spectators, which is why police attempted to keep demonstrations away from the rugby grounds.

For their protection, you know, it's just one of those things you could never underestimate people's passion like [as] much as people were passionate about protesting [there were] these people that would do anything for rugby and if it meant belting somebody around the ears who was a protester, I think, they'd do it and they did do it. So, you did need that separation. You sort of herd cats there and herd cats there and just keep them apart. [It] was a little bit difficult. **Leon Eccersall.**<sup>708</sup>

Leon acknowledges that if someone is truly passionate about something, either protesting against apartheid or watching a game of rugby, then they will do anything to ensure that their aims are

---

<sup>704</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>705</sup> Nalder, [questionnaire], Whangarei, 1 September 2016.

<sup>706</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>707</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>708</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

achieved including resorting to violence to make their position known.<sup>709</sup> Leon had seen protesters being assaulted by rugby supporters and vice-versa following games, which is why police attempted to keep the groups as separate as possible.<sup>710</sup> Police could therefore not understand why protesters kept attempting to break through police lines, as they were there for their own protection.<sup>711</sup>

If protesters had broken into Lancaster Park, well they nearly did, someone would've got killed as easy as that. Rugby supporters were throwing blocks of concrete onto them, a full can, bottles of beer, they just didn't seem to realise that, they thought the police were the enemy in actual fact we're actually saving them from serious injuries. No one won, everybody lost.

**Pete Carrington, Blue Squad Member.**<sup>712</sup>

In order to uphold the rights of all concerned, the police needed to take a firm stance on the situation. This meant maintaining space at all times between protesters and Tour supporters. If these groups were not kept separate, serious injuries could occur on both sides.

### The Police on Game Day

According to Morris and Newnham police used excessive force in order to control demonstrators on the day of the first test match in Christchurch.<sup>713</sup> Red Squad member, Ross Meurant, however stated that only reasonable force was used on protesters during the first test match because police feared that Christchurch would be a repeat of Hamilton.<sup>714</sup> This fear became even more pronounced when protesters made it onto the field from the embankment in Lancaster Park.<sup>715</sup> Police also feared that if they did not remove the protesters, then the rugby fans in the stands would; "[t]hey were screaming for blood and a massive breach of the peace was imminent."<sup>716</sup> However, Meurant does not mention

---

<sup>709</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>710</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>711</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>712</sup> '1981 Tour Special,' *Close Up*.

<sup>713</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 79, and Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 46.

<sup>714</sup> Ross Meurant, *The Red Squad Story*, (Auckland: Harlen Publishing, 1982), 76.

<sup>715</sup> Meurant, *The Red Squad Story*, 76.

<sup>716</sup> Meurant, *The Red Squad Story*, 76.

any use of force when describing the incident on the field at Lancaster Park. According to Meurant, protesters were told to move and within five minutes they realised that they were outnumbered and left the field voluntarily.<sup>717</sup> However, according to protesters who were on the field at Lancaster Park this was not the case:

I didn't see the batons going in on the outsides, but I knew they were there. We were being knocked over, and I felt that it was important that we fall to the ground – only then, in such a position of total submission would the batons cease their motions. We fell in the awkward way that a group with locked arms falls. The batons had done the trick, the game could be saved by force.<sup>718</sup>

According to Morris the police used batons as well as their hands and feet to punch and kick the protesters on the field.<sup>719</sup> Jim Graham was hit by a baton around the back and head.<sup>720</sup> When he was taken from the field he questioned a police officer as to why he was assaulted rather than arrested.<sup>721</sup> The fact that Meurant does not mention any use of force, when removing protesters from the field, affects the perception of these events. If only considering Meurant's perspective, it could be assumed that police did not use any force at all to move protesters along. However, from the recollections recorded in the literature, which have been written by anti-apartheid activists, it is evident that a certain amount of force was used to remove protesters from the field. From Chapple's recollection of what happened it appears as if a substantial amount of force was used.<sup>722</sup> Chapple's memory of events are corroborated by the personal testimony that was collected by Morris and the University of Canterbury following the Tour. The types of injuries that are recorded, with two protesters being

---

<sup>717</sup> Meurant, *The Red Squad Story*, 76.

<sup>718</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archives no.6-113496,' Springbok Rugby Tour Papers, University of Canterbury, 1981, accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

<sup>719</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 79.

<sup>720</sup> Chapple, 1981, 208.

<sup>721</sup> Chapple, 1981, 209.

<sup>722</sup> Chapple, 1981, 208-209.

hospitalised for serious injuries, appear to confirm that excessive force was used to remove protesters from the field.<sup>723</sup>

I was starting to feel groggy. I'd been hit once in the back of the head and once in the face, my teeth were bleeding, my face was feeling sore, and I was starting to feel really staggy.<sup>724</sup>

A girl lay there with a baton-broken cheekbone. The policeman who had carried her out and dumped her outside the park, had returned to the ground – duty completed.<sup>725</sup>

Whilst those on the field inside the park were forcibly removed, the police were confronting those protesters who were attempting to make it onto the No.2 Practice Ground behind Lancaster Park. Protesters were confronted by members of the Red Squad in Lismore Street.<sup>726</sup> One of the major problems with the protest 'assault' group's strategy was that those who had not been privy to the plan prior to the day were not well enough informed on what was supposed to happen.<sup>727</sup> People rushed ahead of the protest marshals and therefore went straight past the coal yard fence where the group was supposed to break through into Lismore Street.<sup>728</sup> By the time the protesters had regrouped, a large Red Squad contingent were waiting for the group on the other side of the fence. Those who broke through the fence were met by batons which were used by the Red Squad to keep the protesters back.<sup>729</sup> Protest marshals felt unable to guide the group through the police line, with many not wearing helmets or any other protection.<sup>730</sup> Getting through the police line was also only half the battle, the group would still need to make it over the corrugated iron fence and then over coils of barbed wire to make it into the No.2 Practice Ground.<sup>731</sup> Police dogs had also been brought in to control the situation and according to Leon, there would only be one winner if protesters went up

---

<sup>723</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no.75-113563.'

<sup>724</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 83.

<sup>725</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no.6-113496.'

<sup>726</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 75-113563.'

<sup>727</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 75-113563.'

<sup>728</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 75-113563.'

<sup>729</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 75-113563.'

<sup>730</sup> Chapple, 1981, 198.

<sup>731</sup> Chapple, 1981, 198.

against police dogs.<sup>732</sup> The 'assault group' therefore withdrew from the confrontation and re-joined the main march on Wilsons Road.

On Wilsons Road demonstrators were confronted by a police line armed with batons. Questionnaire respondent Nick Parker, was in the front row of the march facing the police. He believes that the protesters simply had nowhere to go and this was interpreted by police as failure to comply with direct orders.

We had reached a temporary impasse, wedged in shoulder to shoulder, staring across at each other whilst from rows further back some brave souls were urging us to charge them. Several women walked forward and started hanging garlands of flowers on the presented police batons; antagonising them. This annoyed me because I could tell it wasn't appreciated by the cops. After a while when it was apparent we were not dispersing the cops advanced menacingly towards us. The urge for us to run was overwhelming, but to where? We couldn't retreat through the rows behind us and we sure as hell didn't want to advance. Our arms were interlocked and my knees were trembling with fear. Suddenly whack, whack, whack. The sound of batons impacting on flesh was sickening. Shock, horror. What a sight. The front row parts as the injured are carted away. The batons are now face height and being rapidly thrust at us. Blows to my helmet, loud, deafening. I lose it and start lashing out from my kneeling position on the road. Anybody in a uniform in range is getting punched in the stomach, knees, shins, wherever. I am really angry, furious. **Nick Parker.**<sup>733</sup>

Nick's account of what occurred outside of Lancaster Park during the first test match illustrates that at times police reacted, in a forceful manner, to the provocation of protesters. In this case, the protesters refused to disperse and some demonstrators hung flowers on the police batons which, as noted by Nick, was not appreciated by the police. It can be ascertained that in this instance the police

---

<sup>732</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>733</sup> Parker, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 8 September 2016.

were responding to the actions of protesters and were provoked to act in, what could be seen as, an excessive manner. This account of events also illustrates though, that it was not only police who used force during confrontations with the public, but that protesters also committed acts of violence against police.

Following the second baton charge and a short prayer, the tension had decreased enough that protest marshals were able to guide the group past the police line and through an empty factory yard.<sup>734</sup> As the game began, the police that had been on Wilsons Road began to withdraw in order to attend to the situation inside Lancaster Park and in the coal yards.<sup>735</sup> This gave the main march the opportunity to get as close as possible to the rugby ground as police resources were now stretched. As the march proceeded around Lancaster Park, groups of protesters were left behind at the various roadblocks, that had been set up by police in order to protect the more vulnerable parts of the ground.<sup>736</sup> Prior to the game, these roadblocks, which consisted of jumbo bins filled with sand, were manned by riot squad members.<sup>737</sup> However, as the riot squads had now been called in as reinforcements inside Lancaster Park, these bins were manned by non-riot police officers.<sup>738</sup> It was therefore decided that small groups of protesters would be left at each roadblock in order to stretch police resources even further in the hope of being able to get into Lancaster Park.<sup>739</sup> Brent recalls that the plan turned into a game of “cat and mouse” between the police and protesters, which lasted approximately two hours.

Then we broke up again and we marched and you know we’d head for one gate and they’d block us and then we’d walk away, go somewhere else and there’s little groups all over the place, and I was in one group heading down whatever the main street is which leads into Lancaster Park and there was a line of cops there so the march kept on going and the police reacted too fast. The police at that gate took off to block the street before the end of the

---

<sup>734</sup> Chapple, 1981, 204.

<sup>735</sup> Chapple, 1981, 210-211.

<sup>736</sup> ‘Springbok Tour Archive no. 71-113559,’ and ‘Springbok Tour Archive no.75-113563.’

<sup>737</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 46.

<sup>738</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 46.

<sup>739</sup> ‘Springbok Tour Archive no. 71-113559.’

march had gone past and it was spotted and we turned and ran for the gate, the police got back there just in time to block us out and we stopped and to be honest I think that was just as well cause we might've got onto the ground but we wouldn't have got off, we would've been hurt badly. That was a cat and mouse all-round the place, all day, was unreal. That was the one I rang my mother afterwards, 'I'm okay.'<sup>740</sup>

While the game of "cat and mouse" continued throughout the game, the majority of the main march proceeded around to the main entrance where they participated in a mass sit-in. They sang songs, chanted, and a local minister led the group in a prayer.<sup>741</sup> Inside Lancaster Park, rugby fans were busy watching the game, however they were aware that something was happening outside on the streets surrounding the ground.

When it came to the test over here in Christchurch I was up on the old embankment on the corner. We could look out, over, onto the streets and you could see all of the containers, the police moving around and the protesters in the sort of background. **Kevin Taylor.**<sup>742</sup>

[I was] oblivious to what was going on outside really. I did, thinking back, I did hear noise quite a bit of noise and so forth from the streets around, but yeah didn't really know what was going on outside. **Michael Ward.**<sup>743</sup>

For Kevin, what was happening on the streets was akin to a warzone and it was certainly something that he had never witnessed before in New Zealand. However, the actions of protesters did not affect his enjoyment of the game and he was glad that it had not been cancelled.<sup>744</sup> Likewise, when the protesters inside Lancaster Park were removed from the field by police, cheers and applause erupted from the crowd of rugby fans.<sup>745</sup> Those interviewed, who attended the first test match, recall being

---

<sup>740</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>741</sup> Newnham, *By Batons and Barbed Wire*, 48.

<sup>742</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>743</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>744</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>745</sup> Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016.

pleased when the protesters were taken from the field.<sup>746</sup> They felt that they had no right to be there and that their message would have been just as effective, if not more so, if they had protested outside of the grounds.<sup>747</sup> They all agreed that the police at Lancaster Park were effective and efficient at removing the protesters and ensuring that the game continued.<sup>748</sup> There was also a consensus amongst those who attended the game that police acted in a way that was necessary and appropriate in order to control the situation.<sup>749</sup> They did not believe that the actions of police were excessive or could be classed as police brutality; rather they believed that the police were simply doing their job by ensuring that their right to watch the game was upheld.<sup>750</sup>

The only thing that worried [me] at the start was when the tacks and nails were thrown onto the field, and we thought oh this might not be good, but [the police] got that under control and the game went off really smoothly and it was a great atmosphere. It went really well, it was a really good day. I thoroughly enjoyed it. **Michael Ward.**<sup>751</sup>

Just before the final whistle, the protesters who were still out on the streets around the rugby ground began to leave. There were fears that if rugby fans caught up with protesters following the game then more violence could occur. Jocelyn Papprell recalls that protesters were told to be extremely careful following marches and demonstrations as those who were pro-Tour might become violent, particularly after the consumption of alcohol.<sup>752</sup> She remembers removing all of her 'Stop the Tour' badges before leaving Lancaster Park on the day of the test match to ensure that she would not be

---

<sup>746</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016, and Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>747</sup> Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>748</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016, and Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>749</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016, and Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>750</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016, and Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>751</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>752</sup> Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016.



identified as a protester by rugby supporters.<sup>753</sup> The fear that violence would occur between rugby fans and protesters was not unwarranted, as Leon had witnessed violence between the two groups following games.<sup>754</sup> Apart from Leon, those interviewed never saw any such violence between protesters and rugby fans, or engaged in it themselves.<sup>755</sup> According to Tim Hobbs, he did at times get into arguments with protesters however, these never escalated to physical violence.

I never got into big arguments, or stoushes or anything with anti-apartheid people. Ah, I guess

I might [have] had a few heated discussions, but that's as far as it went.<sup>756</sup>

The police played a significant role in ensuring that protesters did not enter into confrontations with rugby supporters and vice versa. This was one of the main reasons for the police lines which stopped protesters from breaking into rugby grounds. It was not only a way of safeguarding the game, but also of making sure that violence did not break out between the different groups. In order to keep the rugby supporters and demonstrators separate it was necessary, at times, to use force. Leon believed that such use of force helped to ensure the safety of all involved. However, confrontations between police and members of the public, which at times became violent, took a toll on police personnel.

### The impact of the Tour on police personnel

The need to use forceful tactics to keep protesters away from rugby supporters caused significant stress for a number of police personnel. Red Squad member, Ross Meurant, recalls the strain that was placed on officers as a result of confrontations between police and protesters.<sup>757</sup> The use of riot gear and batons was completely foreign to the New Zealand Police before the Tour, as the New Zealand Police were based on the English Bobby and did not carry guns or use batons regularly.<sup>758</sup> Leon had

---

<sup>753</sup> Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016.

<sup>754</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>755</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>756</sup> Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016.

<sup>757</sup> Meurant, *The Red Squad Story*, 60.

<sup>758</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

never even held a long-baton prior to the Tour.<sup>759</sup> The riot-like conditions, that became prevalent on New Zealand's streets during the Tour, were difficult for police to fathom.

It was hard to get your head round, I never ever experienced anything like that and to be on the front line suddenly and you've got a dozen of you across the street and you're told hold that line and you hear the protesters coming down the road for the first time, the chanting, the noise it just goes up your spine. My god it seemed so surreal for New Zealand to be experiencing that. It was spooky. **Leon Eccersall.**<sup>760</sup>

Once the Tour began, police officers were put into difficult, and at times frightening and dangerous situations. Police personnel on the front-lines were spat at and had items, such as bricks and bottles, thrown at them.<sup>761</sup> As a result, some police sustained a number of physical injuries:

*"Constable Rastovich was in great pain with what was later diagnosed as a broken collar bone on one side and dislocated shoulder on the other, as well as a cracked pelvis, cracked ribs, a ruptured ear drum, and large laceration on the side of his face."* **Ross Meurant.**<sup>762</sup>

Police were also verbally abused with words such as 'racist' being used by some protesters.<sup>763</sup> In order to not let such abuse affect him, Leon learnt to distance himself from the situation. He knew that protesters were simply trying to garner a reaction from the police by using such insults and it was best to simply ignore them.<sup>764</sup> Overtime, he became quite dismissive of what protesters shouted, which is probably why a number of protesters described the police as almost 'robotic' when on the front lines.<sup>765</sup> Leon agreed that, to a point, police did become robotic in order to separate themselves from the abuse and the emotional toll of what they were being ordered to do.

---

<sup>759</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>760</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>761</sup> Meurant, *The Red Squad Story*, 128.

<sup>762</sup> Meurant, *The Red Squad Story*, 135-136.

<sup>763</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>764</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>765</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

You couldn't buy in, if you did, if you let all those emotions come into play you could not do your job effectively. You've just got to isolate yourself and if they're pushing people forward there's only one way of stopping it and you've just so gotta cut yourself out of the emotional tie of what's going on.<sup>766</sup>

The stress of what police were ordered to do affected many officers during and after the Tour. Being ordered to stop protesters from breaking through police lines by using force and sometimes getting into violent confrontations affected many officers' mental and emotional wellbeing. Confrontations between police and protesters caused severe stress for officers, however many felt that they had no choice. For police, it came down to survival and doing their job:

It was absolutely terrifying you get a solid line coming at you, all you can see is 40 people wide coming straight at you and they were determined to run you over. The front rows of protesters were literally pushed into us and we had no choice, you know, we weren't going to move, we weren't going to budge at all, and a lot of our guys suffered quite severe stress afterwards. I'm talking about the days that followed, you talked to them they were totally stressed out [by] what they had to do but they had no choice. **Pete Carrington, Blue Squad member.**<sup>767</sup>

Once again, I say out of necessity, nearly survival as well, they weren't gonna stop for us, where we were and unless you counted their physical presence with force. They're in the process of trying to knock your block for a six. I never wanted there to be one winner and that's it. That's the decision that you as an individual have got [to] live with. **Leon Eccersall.**<sup>768</sup>

The media's representation of the police also caused extreme stress for many officers. They did not want to be perceived as violent enforcers, rather they were simply trying to do their job and protect the rights and safety of all involved.<sup>769</sup> At times, the media only further perpetuated the myth that

---

<sup>766</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>767</sup> '1981 Tour Special,' *Close Up*.

<sup>768</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>769</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 18-113508.'

police brutality throughout the Tour was a common occurrence. Following the Molesworth Street incident, *The Evening Post* front page headline read; 'Batons and Blood: Police charge city marchers.'<sup>770</sup> The emphasis was placed on the violence that occurred, rather than looking at the context around it. The reporting of police violence was similar to the media's view on protester violence. The media lost perspective and began to report only on the sensational events, thus skewing the wider public's perception of what was actually happening.<sup>771</sup> Police actions that were considered violent were more newsworthy in the view of journalists at the time, in comparison to the more mundane activities such as calmly escorting a protest group.<sup>772</sup> The media's reporting of the police in this way had an impact on police personnel. At times, it made them feel that they were all doing something wrong and that they were all being overly aggressive.<sup>773</sup> These excerpts from Leon's interview give his perspective on the media's representation of the police:

They got into us, as officers with the two main squads, with the Red and the Blue squads, they took a great deal of flack undeservedly so. They were doing one hell of a job on the front line and it's a select few that can only do it so, it was kind of if we did something wrong we collectively as the police, the two main squads included, they would really splash it out there.<sup>774</sup>

In isolation at times they'd focus on one particular incident. If you play that incident over and over it gets ingrained in people's minds, particularly if it [was] a violent one [and] confrontational one and then people start to think the whole of the police reacted like that. Maybe it was just one street that had the conflict in it and it had to be dealt with in a very forceful manner to counter it. I suppose it's their role to report it, but as a police officer you get sick of seeing that thrown up in your face. It gets to a saturation level, you know, whether

---

<sup>770</sup> 'Batons and Blood: Police charge city marchers,' *The Evening Post*, 30 July 1981, 1, in *Sporting Contacts with South Africa*, (Christchurch: Canterbury Public Library, 1990), 18.

<sup>771</sup> Cameron, *Barbed Wire Boks*, 39.

<sup>772</sup> Cameron, *Barbed Wire Boks*, 39.

<sup>773</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>774</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

you were there or not, whether you knew the conflict that was going on and, you know, how the guys and girls feel and you just don't want to revisit it all the time.<sup>775</sup>

Some protesters understood the position that the police were in and the toll that the Tour was taking on their emotional wellbeing. Christine Beardsley and Jocelyn Papprell believe that many of the police were frightened because they were outnumbered and they had been put into a position that they had not necessarily chosen to be in.

I did see them hit as I'd seen protesters hit, but I think they were frightened. Maybe they were protecting themselves, but it was like a bit of a, I think a war mentality erupted and they were as frightened as a lot of the protesters, in fact probably more frightened because there were fewer of them and more of us. They were told that was your job, you do it. **Christine Beardsley.**<sup>776</sup>

Wilsons Road in 1981, when the game was on in Lancaster Park. A few of us got onto one of the big skips and we were taunting and giving the police a bit of a hard time. The young police officer – I saw a bit of fear in his eyes, really. He was a bit ... and then this older policeman comes out – it's alright, lad, it's alright, lad. And then they were just reinforcing, because I think they were scared that we would break over. I felt a bit ashamed of how rude I was to this police officer. But you got to go into that. Cause there was just lots of shouting and there was ... there was just this general melee of ... It's amazing how crowd mentality can take you over. **Jocelyn Papprell.**<sup>777</sup>

The majority of police did not like what they had to do in order to maintain law and order during the Tour. It caused fear and stress for many officers, but they had a job to do. They had to protect the

---

<sup>775</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>776</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>777</sup> Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016.

rights of all involved and primarily they had to keep people safe. Police personnel therefore had to put their emotions and personal feelings aside in order to do their job.

Police developed mechanisms which helped them to cope with the severe stress which they experienced as a result of the Tour. Leon believes that had the police not adopted such strategies to deal with stress and anxiety then serious issues could have arisen for some officers, including mental health problems. Humour was particularly effective in helping to relieve stress:

We had an incident here in Christchurch when the Springboks were down here at night time and there was a protest group that were gonna march on the Linwood Rugby Clubrooms. So the Inspector in the control room was sending staff there to go and counter the action down there. There was a guy in another patrol car, I don't know whether the Red or Blue squads were down there at all, I can't recall, but one of the guys thought we can have a bit of fun with this so he piped up on the air and he said to the Control Inspector, 'would you like yellow squad to attend that as well sir?' and without even a nanosecond pause he said 'yep by all means yellow squad go in as well.' So, the two guys they rushed back to their police station [and] they got yellow Post-it Notes, put it on their epaulets, and hence all of us, who were working on that particular shift, we gave birth to the yellow squad. It truly was such a hoot and it was yellow squad this, yellow squad that, and we could not contain our laughter at times and to hear on the media the next day about 'oh there's a belief there's been another squad that's been formed the yellow squad or something.' Not too much has been said about it and my wife at work got queried about it 'what's this yellow squad that they've formed up now, what are they gonna do.' Jos kept her mouth closed on that one, but it was a group of bored policemen having a bit of fun, we formed our own squad and we got some pretty good mileage out of it. It was good, you need humour to knock out some of the intensity that was

going on cause you never ever did know what you gonna walk in [on], whether it's just gonna be a passive group who just wanted to talk. **Leon Eccersall.**<sup>778</sup>

Excessive force and acts of police brutality were not as common as what has been believed and perpetuated by anti-apartheid demonstrators. Excessive force did occur in some instances, such as on the field at Lancaster Park, however other examples of police brutality are difficult to substantiate when the context surrounding the events is unclear or unknown. Despite accusations from demonstrators that the police only used force to ensure that rugby games were played, the New Zealand Police maintain that this was not the case. Rather, police officers such as Leon, believe that force was only utilised when absolutely necessary and was implemented in order to protect the rights and wellbeing of all those involved. At times, confrontations between police and protesters did become violent and force was used to stop protesters breaching police lines. These confrontations had a significant impact on the mental and emotional wellbeing of police who were, at times, placed in a no-win situation. However, during the Tour, the New Zealand Police had a job to do; they had to ensure that the rights of protesters, the Springboks, and the Tour supporters were upheld, whilst also attempting to keep the New Zealand public safe.

---

<sup>778</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

## **Chapter Five: Day 57 – The impact and aftermath of the Tour**

It is important to discuss the impact of the Tour on New Zealanders and New Zealand society due to the fact that myths have been created regarding how New Zealand was affected following the Tour. These myths, which have been established by the existing historiography and exist within the New Zealand public's perception on the Tour, argue that the Tour caused divisions amongst families and was a catalyst for change within New Zealand society following the Tour.

According to scholars such as Phillipa Mein Smith, differing opinions on the Tour caused divisions amongst co-workers, friends, and families. It is therefore argued that the Tour negatively affected people's work, family, and social spheres. This chapter challenges this argument as many New Zealanders were able to overcome differences in opinion through mutual respect, while others found support and comradeship in their established relationships.

The next part of this chapter discusses the idea of the 1981 Tour as a watershed moment in New Zealand's history. There is the belief within New Zealand society and within the existing historiography that the Tour was a defining moment for New Zealand. It has been touted as a turning point, which resulted in changes within New Zealand society, with regard to New Zealand's own race relations issues. This chapter challenges the idea that the Tour was a watershed moment by showing the impact of the Tour on New Zealand society. It argues that the Tour was a defining moment in the sense that people became more aware of issues that already existed within New Zealand society. However, the Tour was not the catalyst which led to change, as it has been described as by the secondary literature and by some of the participants of this study. Rather, these changes in New Zealand society were already occurring and thus the Tour was simply one part of a wider trend of transformation.

The third part of this chapter examines the aftermath of the Tour in relation to the anti-apartheid movement and the state of rugby in New Zealand, as well as the changes which occurred in South Africa. For the anti-apartheid movement, and demonstrators, activity did not cease once the Springboks left New Zealand. The anti-apartheid movement became less prominent, though, as



people began to return to their everyday lives. A number of demonstrators, however were not able to regain a sense of normality immediately as court cases hung over those who had been arrested. With regard to rugby, considerable damage had been done because of the Tour, with a decline in participation numbers at lower levels. Many children stopped playing rugby following the Tour and turned to soccer instead. Rugby also continued to be affected in South Africa as a result of the sports boycott, which remained in place until apartheid was abolished in the early 1990s.

The final section of this chapter discusses how the oral history participants of this study feel about their actions and views in hindsight. It has been over 35 years since the 1981 Tour, and as a result of the time that has passed, participants have had the opportunity to reflect upon their behaviour surrounding the Tour. The existing historiography lacks a reflective perspective on the Tour which can provide information regarding how people feel about their actions and behaviours after the event. It is therefore important to examine people's actions and opinions in hindsight, in order to establish whether they regret the decisions they made in 1981 or if they maintain their stance on the Tour today.

### Was New Zealand a divided nation?

The existing historiography of the Tour describes the winter of 1981 as a divisive time that fractured friend and familial relationships. According to Mein Smith, families, friends, and the whole of New Zealand were divided on the Tour; "whole families were riven by conflict, and the entire country became contested ground."<sup>779</sup> Scholars such as Mein Smith and Sebastian Potgieter believe that this division was due to the polarising nature of the Tour.<sup>780</sup> People either supported the Tour or they opposed it; there was no middle ground.<sup>781</sup> Jenny Carlyon and Diana Morrow argue that many New Zealanders struggled to maintain relationships with people whose position on the Tour differed from

---

<sup>779</sup> Mein Smith, *A Concise History of New Zealand*, 242.

<sup>780</sup> Mein Smith, *A Concise History of New Zealand*, 242, and Sebastian Potgieter, 'Barbed Wire Boks: The long shadow of the 1981 Springbok Tour of New Zealand and the United States of America,' (Stellenbosch University: MA Thesis, 2017), 146.

<sup>781</sup> Potgieter, 'Barbed Wire Boks,' 146.

their own.<sup>782</sup> Arguments within homes over the Tour caused conflict and tension amongst families and friends who were not prepared to listen to the opinions of others.<sup>783</sup> There are some prominent examples of this division amongst families, particularly within the rugby fraternity. Robbie Deans, who became an All Black in 1983, supported the Tour because of his love of rugby.<sup>784</sup> However, his sister Jo was strongly opposed to the Tour and joined the protest movement in Wellington.<sup>785</sup> This difference in opinion caused a rift between the siblings that lasted throughout the Tour. Jo could simply not understand why her brother would support a Tour from a country with a morally abhorrent policy.<sup>786</sup> Robbie, on the other hand, could not believe that his sister would oppose a rugby tour, particularly as the sport is so deeply ingrained within the Deans family.<sup>787</sup> It was not until after the Tour that this division within the Deans' family began to heal, however Robbie's decision to tour South Africa unofficially in 1986 with the so-called 'Cavaliers,' once again caused issues.<sup>788</sup> The damage was eventually repaired, but the ability of a rugby tour to cause such divisions within a close-knit family is evidence of how deeply the Tour affected people's lives.

Study participant and protester Jocelyn Papprell also experienced a division in her family as a result of the Tour. Jocelyn's uncle was a member of the NZRFU board and thus Jocelyn's anti-Tour stance caused a rift between herself and her uncle.

My uncle, who was on the Rugby board, didn't want either my brother or I to darken his door during that time, so we didn't. He was my favourite uncle, he used to take me horse-riding and things like that. He was disappointed in me: 'I expect that from your brother, but I'm disappointed in you.' I'm a girl you see, I'm much younger, whereas my brother was this radical, anti-Vietnam war kind of already been tarred with that brush and they thought he'd

---

<sup>782</sup> Carlyon and Morrow, *Changing Times*, 202-203.

<sup>783</sup> Carlyon and Morrow, *Changing Times*, 202-203.

<sup>784</sup> Matt McIlraith, *Robbie Deans: Red, black and gold*, (Auckland: Mower, 2014), 46.

<sup>785</sup> McIlraith, *Robbie Deans*, 46.

<sup>786</sup> McIlraith, *Robbie Deans*, 46.

<sup>787</sup> Robbie's great uncle, Bob Deans, was a member of the original All Blacks team that toured the United Kingdom in 1905.

<sup>788</sup> McIlraith, *Robbie Deans*, 90-91.

influenced me too much. What rubbish. But that was his perception, the youngest girl in the family and that I shouldn't be doing silly things like that. As far as he was concerned, sport and politics did not mix. 'So, what was it going on about? We can't change what happens in another country' – that type of thing. I just thought that was ridiculous and narrow-minded. That was it – 'so off you go, I don't want you here.'<sup>789</sup>



Figure 4. Cartoon by Eric Heath illustrating the apparently divisive nature of the Tour on New Zealand society.

[Source: Eric Heath, 'Divided Loyalties Springbok Tour cartoon,' accessed 14 August 2017, <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/media/photo/divided-loyalties-cartoon-springbok-tour>.]

Fortunately, for Jocelyn this disagreement over the Tour did not affect her relationship with her uncle in the long-term. Eventually the pair were able to move forward, but the Tour is still not discussed by the family: "we didn't ever touch on it again. We just talked about family things and the cows ... just

<sup>789</sup> Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016.

avoided everything else.”<sup>790</sup> As more time has elapsed since the Tour, relationships have begun to be repaired between family and friends who held differing opinions on the Tour.

Furthermore, the existing historiography states that workplaces were also affected by the differing opinions of co-workers. Carlyon and Morrow believe that tensions became strained within workplaces when co-workers disagreed about the Tour.<sup>791</sup> These differences in opinion caused issues for many organisations and in some instances restrictions were enforced to ensure that discussions and arguments did not escalate any further. Chris Smith, who was working as a teacher during the Tour, recalls the principal of her school placing a ban on conversations pertaining to the Tour.<sup>792</sup> This was due to the fact that staff were becoming upset following discussions with people who had opposing views. She remembers the principal stating that, “it is causing far too much division and it’s causing people to react and comment in ways that maybe they might regret at a later date.”<sup>793</sup> Brian Hays, also recalls that, at times, it became very tense in the staffroom at Burnside High School, where he was teaching. However, he does not remember being told to stop discussing the Tour with other staff.<sup>794</sup> The ban on discussing the Tour at Chris’ school, illustrates just how contentious the issue was, even in a professional environment.

Brent Burnett-Jones also encountered tension in his work as a trade union official during the Tour.<sup>795</sup> Through his job, Brent worked with a wide range of people from varying backgrounds on a daily basis. He was a skilled negotiator and was able to take control of difficult situations.<sup>796</sup> When it came to the Tour these attributes were highly valued, particularly during Brent’s time as a protest marshal. In the workplace though, Brent’s position on the Tour was not always accepted. Although the majority of

---

<sup>790</sup> Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016.

<sup>791</sup> Carlyon and Morrow, *Changing Times*, 202-203.

<sup>792</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>793</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>794</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>795</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>796</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

worksites that Brent visited did accept his position on the Tour, at one particular worksite, Brent's views were seen as unacceptable:

I was working in a union, [that] at one level was really strong[ly] [anti]-Tour, but we were also a blue-collar union and there were people there that were pro-Tour. I was totally upfront about where I stood, you know [I] had a HART badge on. They knew my views, some gave you a bit of cheek, some of them disagreed with me. After the Hamilton game two delegates rang the office, one of them said 'we've had a vote and Brent's banned from the worksite.' I found out afterwards that he was so pro-Tour that he just wasn't gonna have me on the site. The other one rang up and said 'look Brent better stay away for a while, I don't think I can protect him.' I found out from a couple of guys on that worksite, and it was a freight yard, and the freight yard guys were a pretty hard case, they had seen me after a march somewhere in a hamburger bar, and they had a discussion whether or not they should beat me up. Fortunately, they decided I was a good guy so they weren't going to, but most of the managers were really good, some of them agreed with me, some of them disagreed but we tried to keep it on a professional level.<sup>797</sup>

The fact that some people were prepared to resort to violence against others whose opinions differed from their own illustrates that the Tour was a serious and contentious issue for New Zealanders. However, not all relationships were affected negatively by the Tour. For the majority of the participants of this study, their relationships were not adversely affected.<sup>798</sup> This was due to the fact that people were primarily friends with like-minded individuals and therefore they had the same views on the Tour, or despite having differing views there was a degree of mutual respect for each other's opinions.

---

<sup>797</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>798</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016; Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016; Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016; Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016; Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

Jocelyn Papprell recalls that all of her good friends shared her opinion, in that they found the policy of apartheid abhorrent and therefore did not want the Springboks to come to New Zealand.<sup>799</sup> She therefore had no issues in regards to having to deal with people, who were close to her, who had a different opinion. During the Tour, the main social activity for her group of friends was actually attending protests and marches.<sup>800</sup> For people such as Jocelyn, protesting against the Tour therefore presented an opportunity to spend time with friends who had similar opinions. Debbie Osborn and Christine Beardsley also agreed that they had no issues within their friend groups because they were friends with like-minded people.<sup>801</sup> Christine believes that she had no issues because she shared similar beliefs and values with her friends: "I guess the friends that I had, I'd chosen them because we had similar values."<sup>802</sup> During the Tour, Christine also made a number of new friends when she was asked to join a group of women who were singing in a band. The band later combined with a group of male musicians and they began to write songs about apartheid and the Tour.<sup>803</sup> Throughout the Tour, Christine sung with the group at a number of rallies and meetings, on the back of a truck.<sup>804</sup> For her, the Tour provided an opportunity to meet new people and form new friendships, and it was through these relationships that Christine began to learn more about apartheid.<sup>805</sup>

When positions on the Tour did differ within friend or family groups, mutual respect and acceptance of each other's views was paramount to ensuring that relationships were not negatively affected. Brian Hays and his former-wife had differing opinions on the Tour as Brian was a vehement rugby supporter, while his then-wife strongly opposed the Tour.<sup>806</sup>

---

<sup>799</sup> Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016.

<sup>800</sup> Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016.

<sup>801</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016, and Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>802</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>803</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>804</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>805</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>806</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

We never argued that much, but we had lots and lots of in-depth discussion[s] and she knew I was pig-headed about it and I knew she was pig-headed about it. We were never gonna shift.<sup>807</sup>

Brian respected his wife's decision to oppose the Tour and to protest against a regime that she saw to be morally wrong.<sup>808</sup> Part of this respect was a result of Brian's belief that people had the right to protest. However, where he and his wife did disagree was in regards to the types of protest tactics that were used.<sup>809</sup> Brian could not support actions that broke the law, such as vandalism against people and property. He recalls one incident where his wife was going to protest outside of the Canterbury Rugby Union offices in Manchester Street.<sup>810</sup> The demonstrators' plan was to break into the offices and cover the walls and office equipment in blood and red paint.<sup>811</sup>

My parting words when she walked out the door were 'if you get arrested don't ring me for bail ring your mother.' I remember that, vividly saying that to her, 'don't ring me' and her mother lived in Blenheim so it was gonna be a little bit of a drive to bring the money down. I said 'if you get arrested while you're protesting, I don't mind you going to protest but don't ring me to bail you out, it's your choice not mine.'<sup>812</sup>

His wife's involvement in vandalism against property went too far for Brian, which is when issues did surface for the couple. Ultimately though, Brian respected his wife, for having her views and beliefs, as he did with a number of his friends who opposed the Tour.<sup>813</sup> This respect for those with a differing opinion than his own is why Brian never attended any rugby games during the Tour and as a result he was able to maintain his relationships with friends and family.

---

<sup>807</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>808</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>809</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>810</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>811</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 36.

<sup>812</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>813</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

I didn't lose any friendships at all over it and I respected them protesting. I wanted to retain my close friendship[s]. I didn't lose any friends over it.<sup>814</sup>

Debbie Osborn's working relationships were not affected by the Tour either due to the respect shown to her by her colleagues. Debbie remembers that she had to fit her protesting around her shift work as a nurse however, she did not advertise the fact that she was an active protester to her colleagues.<sup>815</sup> Debbie recalls arriving at work one day to see a picture of her protesting, that was published in the *Press*, hanging on the staff noticeboard.<sup>816</sup> Debbie saw the picture as a sign of acceptance from her co-workers that they understood what she was doing and respected her opinion.<sup>817</sup> Debbie acknowledges that she was fortunate that her colleagues were, at least on the surface, accepting and supportive of her position.<sup>818</sup> Respect and understanding were therefore necessary in order to prevent fractures within relationships when opinions on the Tour differed. Therefore, in some instances, friendships and relationships were able to transcend the divisions caused by the Tour if people were willing to accept and respect other's opinions and views.

Concern for a loved-one's wellbeing was also a powerful emotion that helped to transcend differences caused by the Tour. Former Police Constable Leon Eccersall's wife, Josie, was not an active protester, but she did not agree with everything that was happening in South Africa and New Zealand with regards to sporting contact and racial inequality.<sup>819</sup> However, Leon personally wanted it to go ahead because of his love of sport.<sup>820</sup> Despite these differences in opinion, Josie's main concern was for her husband's wellbeing during the Tour. As a member of the New Zealand Police, Leon was, at times, in a very dangerous position, especially during protests and at rugby games. Twelve to 15 hour shifts also took a toll on Leon, leading to bouts of exhaustion and fatigue.

---

<sup>814</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>815</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>816</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>817</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>818</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>819</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>820</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.



My wife was very supportive of me such as looking after my welfare, but not agreeing with everything that was going on. She had her own opinion about that, but she was making sure that when I came home, you know, there was a good sleeping, resting environment and was I okay. So that was good to have support from her.<sup>821</sup>

Josie's support and concern for her husband allowed the couple to move past their differences in opinion on the Tour and ensure that they were there for one another during some of the most harrowing days of Leon's police career.

Not all New Zealanders were necessarily affected by the Tour. Many people simply carried on with their everyday lives. According to Palenski, this was due to the fact that many New Zealanders did not have a strong opinion on the Tour.<sup>822</sup> They did not get caught up in what was happening, in regards to rugby or the protests, and were able to maintain a sense of normality.<sup>823</sup> One questionnaire respondent, who has chosen to remain anonymous, simply carried on with her everyday life; however, she did, at times, feel embarrassed because of her lack of an opinion.<sup>824</sup> People who did just carry on were, at times, accused of being pro-Tour because of their lack of action. According to one Christchurch man, writing at the time of the Tour, those who did not speak out about apartheid were "implying consent" for the Tour by remaining silent.<sup>825</sup>

The majority of New Zealanders probably had an opinion on the Tour, because it was such a prominent and controversial issue that reached saturation levels in the media.<sup>826</sup> It therefore would have been difficult to avoid the Tour issue completely. However, many of these people preferred, and choose, not to act on their opinions and therefore continued with their everyday lives. This claim is supported

---

<sup>821</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>822</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 365.

<sup>823</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 365.

<sup>824</sup> ---, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 30 August 2016, and ---, [personal correspondence], Christchurch, 30 August 2016.

<sup>825</sup> 'Springbok Tour Archive no. 65-113554,' Springbok Rugby Tour Papers, University of Canterbury, 1981, accessed 15 April 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

<sup>826</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 365.

by Palenski who believes that some people may have had strong opinions however, they neither attended games if they supported the Tour, or if they opposed it they did not actively protest.<sup>827</sup> Brian Hays was one of these people who had a strong opinion on the Tour and yet did nothing to show his position. He has been heavily involved with rugby as a player, coach, and administrator throughout his life.<sup>828</sup> His enjoyment and involvement in the game meant that he supported the Tour taking place. However, he did not show his support by going to any of the games as a number of his friends opposed the Tour and were therefore protesting outside of the rugby grounds.<sup>829</sup> Brian believes that if he had paid money to see the game he would have gone even if that meant walking through or over his friends: “if I’d paid my money and arrived at the front gate at Lancaster Park and four of my very good friends were standing in front I would’ve walked over them to get in.”<sup>830</sup> However, he did not want to risk his friendships in order to watch a game of rugby and therefore felt that it was best for him to stay away. As a result, Brian was able to maintain his friendships and relationships with people whose opinions differed from his own.

In some instances, the Tour did cause divisions amongst families, friends, and co-workers because of people’s differing opinions on the Tour and sporting contact with South Africa. Fractures in relationships were able to be repaired over time, however, in some cases the Tour is still not discussed openly in order to avoid further arguments. In some instances, though, the Tour did not result in any divisions within established relationships. This was due to the fact that many relationships were able to transcend the differences which were caused by the Tour through mutual respect, understanding, and the holding of similar values.

---

<sup>827</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 365.

<sup>828</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>829</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>830</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

### A loss of innocence or a loss of ignorance?

*“In a way, the shock and disbelief expressed by New Zealanders at what had happened stemmed from witnessing a loss of innocence. The country had faced social disruption before the 1981 Springbok Tour brought to the surface arguments of which New Zealand society assumed it was free – racism and bigotry. If anything, the nation has matured as a result of the Tour.”* **Richard Shears and Isobelle Gidley.**<sup>831</sup>

The Tour has been touted as a watershed moment in New Zealand history when New Zealanders lost their innocence with regards to issues of race in New Zealand society. Within the existing historiography the Tour is seen as a defining moment in the transformation of New Zealand society. Jock Phillips describes the Tour as a “crucial moment in the extraordinary transformation of New Zealand over the past half-century.”<sup>832</sup> In Phillips’ opinion this transformation was a result of the ‘old’ New Zealand belonging, to war veterans, conservatives, and people such as Robert Muldoon, being overtaken by the ‘new’ New Zealand, which encompassed liberals and baby boomers, many of whom had protested against the Tour.<sup>833</sup> Those who belonged to this ‘new’ New Zealand were more aware of issues of social injustice, including inequality and racism, and knew that these problems needed to be addressed. Phillips therefore believes the Tour was a defining moment in New Zealand’s history, a turning point where the ‘new’ generation took over from the ‘old’ and began to address some of the issues in New Zealand society.<sup>834</sup> It needs to be remembered though that as a protester, Phillips was directly involved with the Tour himself, resulting in a certain amount of bias as to the effect he believes his actions and the actions of other protesters had on New Zealand society. This is one of the issues with a substantial amount of the existing literature on the Tour being written by those who were involved themselves and thus had strong opinions on the issue. However, Lucy Arthur agrees with

---

<sup>831</sup> Shears and Gidley, *Storm out of Africa!*, 154.

<sup>832</sup> Phillips, ‘A Nation of Two Halves,’ 19.

<sup>833</sup> Phillips, ‘A Nation of Two Halves,’ 15.

<sup>834</sup> Phillips, ‘A Nation of Two Halves,’ 19.

Phillips, that the Tour was “a defining moment in the country's history, a time when New Zealanders lost their innocence and were forced to question embedded ideas about themselves, their nation, and its place in the world.”<sup>835</sup> Phillips and Arthur believe that the Tour was a watershed moment because it allowed debate and conversation, regarding issues of racism and inequality, to occur which helped to bring about change in New Zealand society.

The Tour has not only been seen as a watershed moment within the existing historiography, but this belief is also held by a number of New Zealanders. The majority of participants of this study, who opposed the Tour, regarded it as a defining moment in New Zealand’s history as they believed that it helped to stimulate debate regarding the place of Māori in mainstream New Zealand society.

Yep I do think it was a watershed moment. It made people aware of, beyond their own backyard, what was happening in the world. No, I’ll rephrase that it helped people consolidate or solidify their views on certain aspect[s] of society. In my circles, it made people talk about things that we’d not really talked about much before. We’d always talked about religion, but now we talked about other things. We talked about injustices in our own country and that we might consider injustices that are happening in the rest [of the] world, but we need to also consider injustices that are happening at home. **Chris Smith.**<sup>836</sup>

I did feel like it was a watershed time and that I grew up, in the sense of a lot of my naivety about the impact of politics or a government’s response to a situation, that really opened my eyes. I understood more about that the strength of the state and I did feel some hope that, eventually, apartheid would disappear. I also thought it’s a moment for New Zealanders to you know, people say grow up, but you know it was a very defining time for people. **Christine Beardsley.**<sup>837</sup>

---

<sup>835</sup> Arthur, ‘Rugby, Racism and Fear,’ 4.

<sup>836</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>837</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

Participants believed that the Tour had exposed New Zealanders to social injustice in South Africa, but perhaps more importantly in New Zealand as well. It presented New Zealanders with the opportunity to talk about issues that had not previously been discussed and made people consider the injustices that were occurring in New Zealand. It must be noted that this belief by participants, who opposed the Tour, may be a reflection of how they see their own role during the Tour. Those who protested against the Tour and apartheid wanted to believe that they made a difference not just in South Africa, but in New Zealand as well. They therefore cited the Tour as a defining moment because of their belief that their actions helped to bring about change.

Following the Tour participants believe that the topic of inequality and racism, not just in South Africa, but in New Zealand as well, began to be discussed more openly and frequently. Issues were brought to the fore as a result of the focus of protests on the issue of racism in South Africa which helped to illuminate the marginalisation of Māori within New Zealand society. Chris Smith believes that this was due to the fact that, in general, New Zealanders became more aware of issues of injustice, as these had been highlighted throughout the Tour.<sup>838</sup> Brian Hays believes that it took a while for people to realise that there were issues. They needed time to reflect and take stock of what had happened during the Tour, and thus, he believes, that there was not an immediate realisation of these issues.<sup>839</sup> In this sense the Tour can be seen as a watershed moment because it helped to make New Zealanders more aware of issues in New Zealand society. The Tour helped to bring issues of racism and inequality to the surface and as a result of this new awareness a 'loss of innocence' for New Zealanders occurred.

This loss of innocence refers to the realisation by New Zealanders following the Tour that issues of racial inequality had not yet been resolved. Leon Eccersall believes that this innocence was particularly prevalent during the 1960s and 1970s because people did not witness overt racism and therefore did

---

<sup>838</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>839</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

not believe that it existed.<sup>840</sup> Leon feels that the Tour took away this “cloak of innocence,” and people finally began to realise that there were issues which needed to be addressed.<sup>841</sup>

That just took the cloak of innocence away from us and [we] realised what we’d done, what we were responsible for, and how we could right it and a lot of people don’t want to right it. It’s all about negotiation now isn’t it. A lot of people need that closure and it’s so empowering to see it when it’s actually happened, so much good comes out of it.<sup>842</sup>

According to Brent Burnett-Jones, the Tour “did puncture the myth of an innocent racially pure society.”<sup>843</sup> William Anderson points out though that it was not really a loss of innocence that occurred in the winter of 1981 but rather a “loss of ignorance.”<sup>844</sup> These issues, which began to be discussed after the Tour, had existed all along, but people had chosen to ignore them in order to maintain the myth of a peaceful and homogenous society. The Tour can therefore be seen as a watershed moment within New Zealand’s history with regard to this loss of ignorance. New Zealanders became more aware of issues within New Zealand society because of the protests surrounding the Tour, which focussed on injustice and inequality. The Tour highlighted these issues and as a result New Zealanders became more aware of them within New Zealand society.

New Zealand historian Paul Moon argues that the Tour was indeed a loss of innocence for the people of New Zealand, but not in the sense that they began to realise that issues of racial inequality existed in New Zealand society. Moon argues that the Tour resulted in a loss of innocence as to how New Zealanders saw themselves.<sup>845</sup> The Tour saw violent civil unrest for 56 days on New Zealand’s streets. New Zealanders fought against fellow New Zealanders in order to get their point across, at times resorting to violence and vandalism. According to Moon, “the result was a significant adjustment in

---

<sup>840</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>841</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>842</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>843</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>844</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>845</sup> Paul Moon, *Turning Points: Events that changed the course of New Zealand history*, (Auckland: New Holland, 2013), 204.

the way the nation saw itself. There was much soul-searching within the country.”<sup>846</sup> The Tour was therefore a watershed moment in the sense that New Zealanders began to see the country not as one harmonious nation, but rather as a country that was diverse and at times oppositional.

*“Maybe the notion of a national loss of innocence was not such a melodramatic way of seeing the 1981 Springbok Tour after all. The unprecedented scale of protests and the violence that increasingly characterised encounters with the police as the Tour went on may have been the result of many people being swept up in the excitement of the moment. However, when the Tour was finally finished ... New Zealand was left staring at a scene of social disorder that to some extent disfigured the country’s previously cosy, friendly perception of itself.”* **Paul Moon.**<sup>847</sup>

Scholars such as Phillips, as well as a number of this study’s participants, believe that the Tour did more than simply make New Zealanders aware of issues in New Zealand society. Rather, they believe that the Tour was a significant catalyst for change with regard to the place of Māori in mainstream New Zealand society.<sup>848</sup> The promotion of Māori history and culture following the Tour lends to the idea that the Tour was a watershed moment in New Zealand’s history.

A number of projects and changes were implemented following the Tour which attempted to educate New Zealanders about Māori history and culture. One of the more prominent projects was Project Waitangi (the Project) which was established in 1986.<sup>849</sup> The purpose of the Project was to educate Pakeha on issues of racism and inequality in New Zealand. Workshops and lectures were held in order to educate Pakeha and stimulate debate and discussion around the Treaty of Waitangi (the Treaty)

---

<sup>846</sup> Moon, *Turning Points*, 204 and 206.

<sup>847</sup> Moon, *Turning Points*, 212.

<sup>848</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016; Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016; Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016, and Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>849</sup> *The Treaty of Waitangi: Questions and answers, a resource kit for Pakeha*, (Wellington: Project Waitangi, 1989), 28.

and other issues relating to Māori.<sup>850</sup> The scope of the Project was somewhat limited as only Christine Beardsley and Brian Hays actually knew about the Project and had some experience with it. Three other participants had heard about the Project; however, they did not know what its purpose was.<sup>851</sup> Christine recalls attending a number of workshops that were run by the Project which helped to open her eyes about inequality in New Zealand.<sup>852</sup> Christine believes that it also helped her to better understand her place within New Zealand society:

I think quite a lot of Pakeha round that stage were feeling guilty once they started to learn about Māori history. My eyes were really opened a lot when I learnt about some of that and I was appalled. I had no idea and I did at times feel guilty, but [I] realise that actually wasn't [a] helpful feeling to have because it was more about well okay this has happened, this is the history, what do we need to do to address this and to make sure that our society, both Māori and Pakeha, how can we make it fairer, how can we make things change so that the society's more just.<sup>853</sup>

As a teacher, Brian also remembers his school being sent free children's books and pamphlets from the Project which helped to increase the discussion around Māori culture, history, and the Treaty.<sup>854</sup>

I think after [the Tour] probably the teaching of the Treaty got a boost. [It] probably rarked [us] up a little bit you know because I don't think I taught much about it beforehand and then after it, not instantly, not the two days after the Springboks went home, but eventually, I think we got a big increase in textbooks.<sup>855</sup>

Following the Tour, Māori culture and history became more widely taught in New Zealand schools. From the 1990s the New Zealand school curriculum began to include the teaching of Māori arts,

---

<sup>850</sup> *The Treaty of Waitangi*, 28.

<sup>851</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016; Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016, and Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>852</sup> Beardsley [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>853</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>854</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>855</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.



culture, and history throughout primary, intermediate, and high school levels. Within today's school curriculum, students learn about the impact of migration on Māori, including the establishment of the Treaty.<sup>856</sup> The Treaty is also discussed in relation to how it has been interpreted by different people at different times in history, as well as how it needs to be understood and interpreted within today's society.<sup>857</sup> The Treaty is therefore taught and discussed throughout a child's education which allows them to gain an understanding of its significance, not only in regards to New Zealand's historical landscape, but also in today's context as well. This treatment of Māori history and culture within schools today is vastly different to how it was taught in the past. It is no longer seen as a historical document, that has little meaning within today's society, rather it is seen as a living agreement that needs to be understood and acknowledged for the impact that it has upon New Zealand, Pakeha, and Māori.<sup>858</sup> Retired school teacher, Chris Smith, believes that the New Zealand school system has come a long way in regards to the teaching of Māori history and culture.<sup>859</sup> However, she believes it is still lacking within the curriculum, particularly in regards to the teaching of Te reo Māori.

The promotion of Māori history and culture following the Tour supports the belief, held by Phillips and some study participants, that the Tour was a watershed moment in New Zealand's history. The elevation of Māori history and culture within schools, and society in general, illustrates that there was a change in New Zealand and thus the Tour could be seen as a turning point. However, the question remains as to whether these changes occurred as a direct result of the Tour or whether they were simply part of a larger trend towards Māori empowerment within New Zealand society.

William Anderson believes that the Tour was not actually a catalyst for change; rather transformation and changes in New Zealand society occurred as a result of wider trends.<sup>860</sup> These trends were already happening in the 1960s and 1970s, when Māori began to demand greater respect within New Zealand

---

<sup>856</sup> Ministry of Education, 'The New Zealand Curriculum,' last updated 25 October 2016, <http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/The-New-Zealand-Curriculum#collapsible14>, 73.

<sup>857</sup> 'The New Zealand Curriculum,' 74.

<sup>858</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>859</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>860</sup> Anderson. [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

society.<sup>861</sup> William believes that the increase in Pakeha awareness of issues of inequality occurred as a result of these Māori movements, which were becoming more widespread at the time.<sup>862</sup> This sentiment is shared by New Zealand historian Tom Brooking, who believes Pakeha became more aware of Māori grievances during the 1960s and 1970s because of the increasing presence of the Māori movement.<sup>863</sup> William believes that the Tour may have helped to highlight the fractures in New Zealand society, however the Māori renaissance, which helped to build confidence, therefore allowing Māori to ask for equality and respect, was already gaining.<sup>864</sup> William therefore believes that New Zealand society was changing anyway and the Tour was not the significant fracture point that resulted in these changes.<sup>865</sup>

Moon believes that the Tour was a turning point in New Zealand society, however he argues that this was a result of many different developments occurring at once, with the Tour simply being one part of a larger movement. Moon argues that the Tour was, “one of those turning points in New Zealand’s history which relied on the convergence of several social and political developments at one moment.”<sup>866</sup> Moon believes that the Tour was therefore part of a larger trend towards Māori empowerment, which included events such the Land March and the occupations of Bastion Point and Raglan.<sup>867</sup> Māori were therefore already campaigning for greater respect and equality in New Zealand society and this is why strategies, such as Project Waitangi, were implemented and changes, including the re-evaluation of the school curriculum, occurred. Moon argues that it is short-sighted to claim the Tour as the catalyst for these changes, as this ignores events which were part of the Māori renaissance movement.<sup>868</sup> He states that claims regarding the Tour as the central point which resulted in change,

---

<sup>861</sup> Brooking, *The History of New Zealand*, 147.

<sup>862</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>863</sup> Brooking, *The History of New Zealand*, 147.

<sup>864</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>865</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>866</sup> Moon, *Turning Points*, 204.

<sup>867</sup> Moon, *Turning Points*, 206.

<sup>868</sup> Moon, *Turning Points*, 206.

“ignore the longer periods that are necessary to shape social change.”<sup>869</sup> The Tour was therefore just one part of a larger transformation which began with an increase in Māori empowerment in the 1960s.

Within the New Zealand consciousness and the existing historiography, the Tour is still touted as a watershed moment. However, it is clear that some New Zealanders have questioned whether the Tour was actually the catalyst for change within New Zealand society. In many ways, the Tour is part of a much larger trend. It is part of a greater package of events and developments which were occurring during the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, where Māori began to demand respect and equality. As a result of this increasing presence of the Māori movement, Pakeha became more aware of issues of inequality and subsequently changes began to occur particularly with regards to the promotion of Māori culture and history in schools. The Tour may have brought the issues which Māori were highlighting during the Māori movement to the fore, however it was not necessarily the catalyst for change. The Tour illuminated issues of racism and inequality within New Zealand society and resulted in a loss of ignorance for many New Zealanders. In this way, the Tour could be seen as a watershed moment as it made people more aware of the issues that existed within New Zealand society. However, in the sense of being the primary catalyst for change, the Tour should not be considered as a watershed moment. This is due to the fact that changes were already occurring in New Zealand society as a result of the Māori renaissance movement.

There was the belief amongst some Māori that the Tour did not result in any changes in New Zealand society with regards to increasing awareness of racial inequality. Some Māori believed that many New Zealanders simply missed the point of connecting the oppression caused by apartheid with the exclusion of Māori from, and issues of racism within, New Zealand society. Writing in *Broadsheet* magazine at the end of 1981, Donna Awatere, claimed that the majority of Pakeha still did not understand this connection.<sup>870</sup> She believes that they did not see Māori as being oppressed and

---

<sup>869</sup> Moon, *Turning Points*, 206.

<sup>870</sup> Donna Awatere, ‘Rugby, Racism and Riot Gear: New Zealand in the winter of 1981,’ *Broadsheet*, no. 94, November 1981, 12.

therefore saw no point in standing united with them.<sup>871</sup> Awatere states that despite the new awareness of racial inequality within New Zealand following the Tour, “black people in New Zealand essentially stand alone.”<sup>872</sup> Kevin Taylor also believes that the Tour did not really change how Māori were treated within New Zealand society.<sup>873</sup> In regard to Pakeha awareness of Māori grievances Kevin believes that many New Zealanders still have not “taken the blinkers off.”<sup>874</sup> He feels that there is still a lack of understanding with regards to Māori culture and history and its place in New Zealand society. Kevin believes that the best way to help people understand is through education, ideally with all children learning Te reo Māori from an early age.<sup>875</sup> He feels that there has been some progress, however, for him, it is taking too long.<sup>876</sup>

Some New Zealanders have also questioned whether any changes did occur following the Tour as issues of racism still exist within New Zealand society today. For instance, Kevin’s daughter, who was made head girl at her high school, was approached by three fellow students who stated that she only got the position because she was Māori.<sup>877</sup> Kevin and his wife even debated whether to give their three daughters Māori names, because he did not want them to experience the racism that he had throughout his life.<sup>878</sup> Furthermore, Christine Beardsley, has spoken to numerous people who still experience racism within their everyday lives.

The other day I was teaching a course in Auckland. It was a customer service course and we were looking at, you know, how do you demonstrate empathy towards customers and I said to them, ‘so what is the thing that’s most annoying to you as a customer or what are the things that, you know, you don’t like.’ Some of the Māori people in the group said to me ‘going into a shop and being followed around,’ and I just cringed, I thought oh gosh. I know it’s still there,

---

<sup>871</sup> Awatere, ‘Rugby, Racism and Riot Gear,’ 12.

<sup>872</sup> Awatere, ‘Rugby, Racism and Riot Gear,’ 12.

<sup>873</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>874</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>875</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>876</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>877</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

<sup>878</sup> Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016.

it is something that we're living with but I just felt so sad. I thought nobody's ever followed me round in a shop and I'd never expect them to, but that being a more common occurrence and I just thought oh gosh, we've still got a long way to go.<sup>879</sup>

The Tour can be seen as a watershed moment with regards to highlighting issues within New Zealand society. However, it was not a significant catalyst for change as the Māori movement, which included actions such as the Land March, was already bringing about change by demanding that Māori were treated equally within New Zealand society. The Tour was therefore part of a wider trend that ultimately brought about change for Māori in New Zealand.

### Regaining a sense of normality

The final test match at Eden Park in Auckland culminated in the most violent protests of the entire Tour. Demonstrators made their way into the grounds throwing smoke bombs onto the field, while a plane flew over the stadium dropping anti-apartheid pamphlets and flour bombs onto the rugby players below.<sup>880</sup> The escalation of violence throughout the Tour meant that when the Springboks departed New Zealand on September 13, the country could finally breathe a sigh of relief. The Tour was over and nobody had been killed or seriously injured in the riot-like conditions that occurred on New Zealand's streets. Protester Debbie Osborn was relieved when the Springboks left. It had been a "horrible time" and it was good that it was finally over.<sup>881</sup> However, joy and jubilation were not emotions felt by anti-apartheid demonstrators.<sup>882</sup> They had not been successful in stopping the Tour and only two games had been abandoned or cancelled as a result of protest action and security concerns.<sup>883</sup> Rather, protest marshal, Brent Burnett-Jones, felt "sad," "depressed," and "bitter."<sup>884</sup>

---

<sup>879</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>880</sup> Shears and Gidley, *Storm Out of Africa!*, 142.

<sup>881</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>882</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>883</sup> Shears and Gidley, *Storm Out of Africa!*, 46 and 91. The Hamilton game on July 21 and the Timaru game, which was to be played on August 19, were cancelled as a result of protester activity and security concerns.

<sup>884</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

Tour supporter Tim Hobbs was pleased that the Tour was over and as a rugby fanatic, he was happy that the majority of games had been played with only minor interruptions from demonstrators.<sup>885</sup> Former Police Constable, Leon Eccersall, was also pleased that the games had been played, however he was more interested in regaining a sense of normality once the Tour was over.<sup>886</sup> Throughout the Tour, police officers worked 12-hour shifts, with Leon explaining that some days these shifts extended out to 15 hours.<sup>887</sup> Working these long shifts, almost every day for 56 days led to extreme exhaustion and as a result Leon was relieved when it was finally over and he was able to resume normal work hours.<sup>888</sup>

Exhaustion was not only experienced by police personnel, but by anti-apartheid demonstrators as well. Brent did not realise just how exhausted he was until the Tour was over.<sup>889</sup> Preparing for protests and attending marches and meetings were draining tasks for anti-apartheid demonstrators. These tasks took demonstrators away from their family and friends, as the act of opposing apartheid became all consuming. Chris Smith recalls that her social life was completely dominated by the Tour:

I thought about it all the time. I couldn't wait to get the paper and read what had happened, I couldn't wait to hear the news. I thought about it, read about it, watched it, and listened to it and at the weekends protested about it.<sup>890</sup>

The Tour was, for demonstrators, emotionally, mentally, and physically draining and it was not until it was over that people were finally able to stop and reset after the tumultuous time. There was a need to get back to normality which, in some cases, was a particularly hard adjustment. So much time and energy had been spent on the protests that other aspects of everyday life had been put to one side.<sup>891</sup> Jocelyn Papprell jokingly commented that she was so busy with the Tour it is not surprising that she

---

<sup>885</sup> Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016.

<sup>886</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>887</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>888</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>889</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>890</sup> Smith, [questionnaire], Christchurch, 15 August 2016.

<sup>891</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 111, and Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016.

does not remember what she learnt at Teachers' College that year.<sup>892</sup> After the Tour people could finally get back to their regular, everyday life of work and school. According to Juliet Morris, this must have come as quite a shock to protesters who had spent months consumed with the "hectic pace" of protesting.<sup>893</sup>

However, even after the Springboks had left and the protesting had finally come to an end some demonstrators still had to make an appearance in court. Morris believes that this process meant that people had to relive the Tour all over again and without the support of the movement.<sup>894</sup> They were also unable to completely move on until they had appeared in court. Brent was arrested during the Tour for obstructing a carriageway during a sit-in at the intersection of Gloucester and Colombo Streets in Christchurch.<sup>895</sup> Following the Tour, he still had not been to court. The courts were incredibly busy as they attempted to clear all of the cases which had been brought against demonstrators who were arrested during the Tour.<sup>896</sup> When Brent's case finally went to court, he pleaded guilty and asked for leniency. He told the judge that his actions were a result of the Tour being a "unique time in our country's history and it's a very minor offence."<sup>897</sup> Brent was discharged without conviction and believes that this outcome was a result of his honest admission to the judge that he had broken the law.<sup>898</sup> Debbie Osborn was also arrested on five different occasions for obstructing a carriage way and for damaging property.<sup>899</sup> Debbie recalls having to wait about four months to appear in court on the final charge, for which she had spent the night in jail.

So that kind of hung over me a bit actually. One of the reasons it hung over me was I suddenly thought I might be wanting to go somewhere where I can't go if I've got a criminal record. I'd already made plans that I was travelling over to Germany and Europe, but I hadn't made any

---

<sup>892</sup> Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016.

<sup>893</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 111.

<sup>894</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 111.

<sup>895</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>896</sup> Morris, *With All Our Strength*, 109.

<sup>897</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>898</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>899</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

plans to travel to the States anyway and I know they're pretty tough. The court date was [at the] beginning of December and so that came and I was discharged without conviction. I think they realised that it was futile. There were too many people, they were holding up the court system and the Springbok Tour was gone by then, you know, it was all over so let's just move on.<sup>900</sup>

Following the Tour, the anti-apartheid movement in New Zealand became far less prominent. William Anderson believes that this was due to the fact that protesters no longer had a focal point that they could rally around.<sup>901</sup> He believes that had there been a successive tour shortly after 1981 then the movement would have continued to actively protest and campaign against apartheid.<sup>902</sup> Without a focal point media coverage of the movement also slowly ebbed away and the cause lost momentum. People moved on and refocused their attention on aspects of their lives which had been neglected during the Tour. For Debbie, she began to focus on her impending overseas trip and believes that the movement simply "drifted apart" as there was no longer a point of convergence to keep people together.<sup>903</sup>

For a number of years organisations, such as HART, continued to work in the background to bring about the end of apartheid, with protests being held when further sporting contact with South Africa was suggested. Brent Burnett-Jones recalls joining a protest march against the 1986 Cavaliers tour.<sup>904</sup> However, these protests were considerably smaller than those of 1981 and for Brent this was his last protest. HART was disbanded in 1992 when the apartheid regime was abolished.

---

<sup>900</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>901</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>902</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>903</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>904</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.



### The state of rugby after the Tour

We were very stretched to keep rugby going, lots of people changed sport, lots of people started soccer. The game of rugby was seriously impacted upon. **Brian Hays on the fate of rugby.**<sup>905</sup>

Following the Tour, rugby in New Zealand was adversely affected. According to sports writer, Don Cameron, there was a decline in participation and support for the game.<sup>906</sup> Cameron believes that this decline in participation was a result of anti-rugby sentiment which developed because of the Tour.<sup>907</sup> Demonstrators were angry that the decision to allow the Tour to go ahead had ultimately been left up to the NZRFU. They were also frustrated that rugby's governing body had refused to listen to any advice or consider the wider implications when it decided not to cancel the Tour.<sup>908</sup> Demonstrators viewed rugby as the sport that condoned apartheid. Cameron believes that the NZRFU was seen by many New Zealanders to be the "villain" and was therefore responsible for the riot-like conditions that occurred on New Zealand's streets.<sup>909</sup> It is therefore, not surprising that participation numbers in the sport declined. During the Tour, for example, William Anderson stopped playing rugby as he found that it became difficult to be a part of an environment that condoned apartheid.<sup>910</sup> For William, his decision to no longer be involved with rugby was an issue of morality; he could not play a game that appeared to support South Africa's racial policies.<sup>911</sup>

Rugby was primarily affected at the lower levels, in particular at schools, where participation significantly declined following the Tour. Cameron believes that this was a result of the increasing anti-rugby sentiment amongst school teachers and young parents.<sup>912</sup> Brian Hays noticed that a number of

---

<sup>905</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>906</sup> Cameron, *Barbed Wire Boks*, 19.

<sup>907</sup> Cameron, *Barbed Wire Boks*, 19.

<sup>908</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016; Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016, and Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

<sup>909</sup> Cameron, *Barbed Wire Boks*, 18.

<sup>910</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>911</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>912</sup> Cameron, *Barbed Wire Boks*, 226.

co-educational schools, such as Burnside High School, where he worked, stopped playing rugby in the immediate aftermath of the Tour.<sup>913</sup> He believes that a large percentage of school teachers simply refused to coach the sport following the Tour as they themselves had protested against apartheid.<sup>914</sup> Single-sex boys' schools and schools in rural areas were not affected as significantly due to the fact that boys continued to want to play the game and that anti-Tour sentiment was not as prevalent in rural areas.<sup>915</sup> This suggests that the decline in participation was uneven with boys' schools and rural schools remaining loyal to rugby. It was not only school teachers who no longer wanted to coach rugby though; a number of parents did not want their children to play either.<sup>916</sup> This was due to the fact that a number of young parents had protested and according to Leon Eccersall, one way to hurt the NZRFU for going ahead with the Tour was to withdraw support for rugby.<sup>917</sup> The decline in participation at the lower levels was where the Tour had its biggest impact on the sport and it would take a number of years for it to fully recover.<sup>918</sup>

According to scholars Paul Smith and Louise Callan, the decline in rugby participation was not a result of the Tour, but rather due to the increasing popularity of soccer.<sup>919</sup> Rugby was considered to be quite a violent and aggressive game and therefore parents did not want their children to play for fear of serious injuries.<sup>920</sup> Soccer, in comparison, was considered to be less aggressive and thus it appealed to a wider group within New Zealand society.<sup>921</sup> Furthermore, soccer became popular following the Tour as a result of the success of the All Whites, New Zealand's national soccer team.<sup>922</sup> In 1982 the All Whites secured their place in the Soccer World Cup Finals, an achievement which was celebrated

---

<sup>913</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>914</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>915</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>916</sup> Cameron, *Barbed Wire Boks*, 226.

<sup>917</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>918</sup> Cameron, *Barbed Wire Boks*, 226.

<sup>919</sup> Paul Smith and Louise Callan, *Our People, Our Century: 1900-2000*, (Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett, 1999), 230.

<sup>920</sup> MacDonald, *The Game of Our Lives*, 107.

<sup>921</sup> Smith and Callan, *Our People, Our Century*, 230.

<sup>922</sup> MacDonald, *The Game of Our Lives*, 107.

throughout New Zealand.<sup>923</sup> Part of soccer's increase in popularity can be attributed to this success as New Zealanders tend to support teams and sports more when they are doing well.

It was not only rugby in New Zealand that was negatively affected as a result of the Tour. Rugby in South Africa was also damaged. South Africa did not play any official rugby games with countries affiliated to the International Rugby Board (IRB) between 1984 and 1992.<sup>924</sup> However, unofficial contact continued. The IRB schedule had, since 1970, included an All Black tour of South Africa in 1985.<sup>925</sup> The NZRFU still wanted this tour to go ahead, despite the conflict and controversy which had occurred in 1981.<sup>926</sup> The new Labour Government and Prime Minister David Lange did not want the All Blacks to tour South Africa in 1985.<sup>927</sup> However, the Government could not withhold passports, nor stop New Zealanders from travelling to South Africa.<sup>928</sup> During a meeting with NZRFU Chairman, Ces Blazey, Lange firmly stated that the tour should not proceed.<sup>929</sup> However, Blazey declared in April 1985 that the tour would go ahead as planned and also announced that the NZRFU strongly disagreed with the attempts at political interference in sporting matters.<sup>930</sup> Ensuring that the tour went ahead though was not as simple as Blazey had hoped. The 1981 Tour had resulted in division amongst New Zealand's rugby unions, with the Auckland Union publicly stating that any future contact with South Africa would further harm the sport.<sup>931</sup> Legal action was therefore taken against the NZRFU in order to have the tour cancelled. Patrick Finnigan and Philip Recordon, who were members of Auckland rugby clubs that were affiliated with the Auckland Union, brought a legal case against the NZRFU.<sup>932</sup> They challenged the decision of the NZRFU on the basis that a tour would be in contradiction of the NZRFU's own

---

<sup>923</sup> '1982 Football World Cup - introduction,' last updated 5 August 2014, <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/culture/1982-soccer-world-cup>.

<sup>924</sup> Zavos, *Winters of Revenge*, 206.

<sup>925</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 370.

<sup>926</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 370.

<sup>927</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 222.

<sup>928</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 218.

<sup>929</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 224.

<sup>930</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 227.

<sup>931</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 370.

<sup>932</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 229.

guidelines that it was its responsibility to “promote, foster, and develop” rugby.<sup>933</sup> They believed the tour would go against what was “in the best interests of the game” and thus the NZRFU were harming rugby by allowing a tour to proceed.<sup>934</sup> The case went to trial in the High Court on July 8, just nine days before the All Blacks were to depart for South Africa.<sup>935</sup> It was clear that the case could not be completed within the short time frame and so an interim injunction was applied for by the plaintiffs in an attempt to prevent the team from leaving until the trial had been completed.<sup>936</sup> High Court Judge, Maurice Casey, ruled that because a tour would not be in the interests of the wider New Zealand public, it was necessary for the case to continue so as to establish that the decision to tour had been lawfully made by the NZRFU in accordance with its own guidelines.<sup>937</sup> He therefore granted the injunction.<sup>938</sup> By July 15, the NZRFU announced that they had run out of time to send a team to South Africa on July 17 and as a result the tour was cancelled.<sup>939</sup> Blazey also announced that they would not be appealing against the injunction, nor would another tour be possible in 1985.<sup>940</sup> A tour did, however, go ahead, unofficially, in 1986.

Following the NZRFU’s announcement that the 1985 tour had been cancelled a number of All Blacks were extremely disappointed. Discussions subsequently took place amongst the players about going to South Africa anyway.<sup>941</sup> The rumoured amount that players would be paid to tour was \$50,000 each.<sup>942</sup> Despite lawyers advising against this tour, as legal action could be brought against the players, 28 out of the 30 All Blacks who had been set to tour South Africa in 1985, were still prepared to go.<sup>943</sup> In January 1986, a Hong Kong newspaper revealed that the SARB were going to invite a world team to

---

<sup>933</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 229.

<sup>934</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 229.

<sup>935</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 231.

<sup>936</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 231.

<sup>937</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 232.

<sup>938</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 233.

<sup>939</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 233, and Palenski, *Rugby*, 372.

<sup>940</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 233.

<sup>941</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 372.

<sup>942</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 268.

<sup>943</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 372, and Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 268-269. Two players from the original team, John Kirwan and David Kirk, refused to join the ‘rebel tour’.

celebrate the IRB's centenary.<sup>944</sup> The team would be comprised of New Zealand, Australian, and French players.<sup>945</sup> By March, Blazey had confirmed that invitations had been received by individual players and rumours were rife that the entire team would be made up of All Blacks.<sup>946</sup> Danie Craven, Chairman of the SARB, attempted to dissociate himself with this team, describing the rumours as lies.<sup>947</sup> However, this was difficult to do as it was Craven who had helped to organise the tour with the Transvaal Rugby Football Union.<sup>948</sup> Blazey wrote to Craven and stated that this tour was "unauthorised" and "unsanctioned" by the NZRFU.<sup>949</sup> However, there was nothing that the NZRFU could do to stop the tour, especially as 14 players had already left for South Africa by the time the news broke.<sup>950</sup>

The players were charged by the NZRFU with two counts of misconduct; they had left New Zealand to play in South Africa without the Union's permission and they did not complete an application for clearance.<sup>951</sup> The NZRFU Council found all 30 players guilty on the first charge, but not the second.<sup>952</sup> The players were reprimanded and banned for two games.<sup>953</sup> Palenski argues though that they were actually only banned for one game, as selection for the first game took place whilst the Cavaliers, as the rebel team called themselves, were still in South Africa and they were therefore ineligible for selection on the grounds of residence.<sup>954</sup> This argument gives the appearance that the players simply received a 'slap on the wrist.' However, Palenski fails to realise that players were more adversely

---

<sup>944</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 268.

<sup>945</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 268.

<sup>946</sup> *Evening Post*, 3 March 1986, in Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998), 268-269, and *Press*, 31 March 1986, in Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998), 269.

<sup>947</sup> *Evening Post*, 1 April 1986, in Malcolm Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998), 269.

<sup>948</sup> Nauright, *Sport, Cultures and Identities in South Africa*, 151.

<sup>949</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 373.

<sup>950</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 374, and Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 269.

<sup>951</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 374.

<sup>952</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 374.

<sup>953</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 374.

<sup>954</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact*, 269, and Palenski, *Rugby*, 374.

affected by the rebel tour. Robbie Deans discussed the tour in his biography, stating that it was one of the factors that led to the end of his All Blacks career. Robbie reflected upon the tour stating that:

*"I think most of us, even knowing where it was going to end, probably still would have gone. It wasn't the wrong thing to do, although we now know that it was realistically a no-win situation. But you make those decisions in real time and then you live with them!"*<sup>955</sup>

When demonstrator Chris Smith heard about the rebel tour she simply could not understand why they had wanted to go.<sup>956</sup> It was at this point that Chris stopped watching rugby altogether and has not watched it with any interest since.<sup>957</sup> It is clear that the rebel tour did not help to bring rugby back to its pre-1981 popularity levels. Rather, it only increased hostility towards the game, particularly from those who had protested against the 1981 Tour and did not want sporting contact with South Africa to continue until apartheid had been abolished.

It was not until the 1987 Rugby World Cup (RWC) that rugby in New Zealand began to show signs of recovery in terms of participation at the lower levels. The RWC was established by the IRB in order to bring unity back to the game which had become disjointed during the 1980s because of the issues surrounding South Africa and apartheid.<sup>958</sup> In 1985, Australia, New Zealand, and France strongly pushed for a world tournament to be adopted by the IRB.<sup>959</sup> South Africa also voted for a tournament to take place, despite the fact that it would not be able to join until the sports boycott had been lifted.<sup>960</sup> This support from South Africa persuaded England and Wales to vote in favour as well and as a result the first RWC was jointly hosted by Australia and New Zealand.<sup>961</sup> The winning of the inaugural tournament by the All Blacks at Eden Park helped to repair some of the damage to rugby's reputation

---

<sup>955</sup> McIlraith, *Robbie Deans*, 100.

<sup>956</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>957</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>958</sup> 'The Long Road to the Cup,' accessed 14 June 2017, <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/culture/1987-rugby-world-cup/the-world-cup-is-born>.

<sup>959</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 381.

<sup>960</sup> 'The Long Road to the Cup.'

<sup>961</sup> MacDonald, *The Game of Our Lives*, 121.

which had been caused by the 1981 Tour and the 1986 rebel tour. In regards to South Africa, rugby tours resumed once apartheid was abolished in 1992.<sup>962</sup> The IRB voted for South Africa to host the RWC in 1995, which the Springboks won 15-12 against the All Blacks.<sup>963</sup>

### Apartheid and South Africa

The increase in economic and trade sanctions against South Africa during the 1980s was one of the main catalysts for the abolition of apartheid. South African President, Pieter Botha realised that in order to ensure South Africa did not become completely isolated both economically and socially, the apartheid regime would need to be reformed.<sup>964</sup> The first major reform gave coloured and Indian South Africans the right to vote in 1983.<sup>965</sup> However, black South Africans were not eligible to vote and as a result the first elections were widely boycotted.<sup>966</sup> Over the next year a number of apartheid laws were abolished or reformed including the pass laws, which restricted movement between certain areas.<sup>967</sup> Botha's Government however, refused to allow other political parties, such as the ANC to re-establish, thus ensuring that the National Party remained in power.<sup>968</sup> In 1989, Botha suffered a stroke and was replaced by F.W. de Klerk who announced in February 1990 that he would abolish all discriminatory laws and lift the ban on other political parties.<sup>969</sup> Nelson Mandela was also released from prison on February 11 1990 after 27 years in jail.<sup>970</sup> Fearing that violence would break out as a result of the abolition of apartheid, a referendum of white voters was held with 68% voting in favour of abolishing apartheid.<sup>971</sup> The first free elections, where everyone was eligible to vote regardless of

---

<sup>962</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 384.

<sup>963</sup> Palenski, *Rugby*, 384.

<sup>964</sup> Lapping, *Apartheid*, 168-169.

<sup>965</sup> Lapping, *Apartheid*, 170-171.

<sup>966</sup> Davenport and Saunders, *South Africa*, 503.

<sup>967</sup> Templeton, *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts*, 259.

<sup>968</sup> Davenport and Saunders, *South Africa*, 643.

<sup>969</sup> Davenport and Saunders, *South Africa*, 643.

<sup>970</sup> Davenport and Saunders, *South Africa*, 515.

<sup>971</sup> Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*, 229.

race, were then held in April 1994.<sup>972</sup> The ANC won 62% of the vote and Nelson Mandela became the first black South African President.<sup>973</sup>

In New Zealand, the news that apartheid had been abolished and that Mandela had been elected as President was met with joy from anti-apartheid demonstrators:

I was overjoyed. I just remember seeing black South Africans dancing, I remember seeing Desmond Tutu dancing and I just thought oh my god this is absolutely fantastic, glorious, look how they're celebrating. I was I [suppose] euphoric. There would've been some euphoric moments in that and just thinking, yes things can progress. It can take too long, but sometimes you get there. **Christine Beardsley.**<sup>974</sup>

I was pleased. I mean it had to happen eventually. The fact that it happened and Nelson Mandela became leader, it was brilliant. I knew it was going to happen. I was pleased it happened. I was pleased that he was able to take over and it happened in his lifetime and that he had such a wonderful life afterwards, but, you know, I could say I did my bit. Such an incredibly minute role. I marched against South African apartheid rugby in 1981 and I took part in other stuff leading up to that, so yeah I did my part, but it was not [just] me, it was the thousands in New Zealand who did it and even then, it wasn't just us. It had to happen eventually. **Brent Burnett-Jones.**<sup>975</sup>

[I was] incredibly relieved and pleased for those people and proud that hopefully we'd had something to do with it. I just felt that how could people [have] been so oppressed for so long and that we thought it was okay. I'm pleased, I know they've got lots of troubles and

---

<sup>972</sup> Davenport and Saunders, *South Africa*, 568.

<sup>973</sup> Davenport and Saunders, *South Africa*, 568.

<sup>974</sup> Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016.

<sup>975</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.



difficulties in South Africa now, but that's as a result of what they've all been through. **Chris Smith.**<sup>976</sup>

Anti-apartheid demonstrators felt that they had played their part and been actively involved in the eventual abolishment of apartheid in South Africa. This feeling was confirmed for demonstrators when in February 1994, just before the first free elections, South African President F. W. de Klerk admitted that international pressure, as a result of economic sanctions and sports boycotts, had significantly contributed to the crippling of South Africa's economy and thus had been a catalyst to bring about an end to apartheid.<sup>977</sup>

### The value of hindsight

Researching and writing this thesis over 35 years after the events of 1981 has enabled questions to be asked about people's feelings and actions in hindsight. Hindsight can be a powerful historical tool as it allows people to reflect on their actions and opinions of the past, many years after the event. The time that has elapsed since the event allows people to analyse their past actions with a fresh perspective. For this research, each participant was given the opportunity to reflect upon their position on the Tour and the actions that they took to demonstrate their stance. The following excerpts describe the participants' thoughts on their actions and perspectives in hindsight:

I don't know if pride [is] the word. I wasn't involved in punching a police officer, so if I'd had the same position against the Tour and I'd been more physically involved then you may regret some of those activities, but my position hasn't changed. If you see these sorts of institutions, where[ever] they may exist around the world, you'd still be against them for the same reason. So, no I think nothing has really changed in my political convictions at that level. **William Anderson.**<sup>978</sup>

---

<sup>976</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>977</sup> Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*, 230.

<sup>978</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

I wouldn't have changed. The one thing I am glad of [is] that I was never involved in actual violence myself and I never had violence done to me. I knew what I was doing. I think in the situation, at the time, protesting was the right thing to do. I would still stand up for what I believed in. I still do stand up for what I believe in and I'm not scared of saying what I believe in, I don't shoot my mouth off. I'm measured in my approaches to things. **Chris Smith.**<sup>979</sup>

I was on the right side and I did the right things no regrets. I learnt from it, probably not as much as I should in many areas. But would I do things differently? Possibly. Would I change sides? Would I change my views? No. Looking at the Tour generally, I'm proud of what I did. I think I know I was on the right side. There might be [the] odd day to day things I would've done differently, but no. Maybe even more aggressive in my leadership involvement, but no overall, I'm happy. **Brent Burnett-Jones.**<sup>980</sup>

I carry no guilt about what I did and what I was responsible for. How do you sum it all up really? It was a very complex phase of New Zealand history that I was a part of. I'm not ashamed of what I did, I'm not ashamed of what the Department stood for. Like I said, I carry no guilt whatsoever, and in fact I'm proud of the guys and girls that worked through that, life's unique experience that touched us all. I think I would still go down that same road. I wouldn't change it cause like I said, at the time, I was a sworn police officer, I'd taken that oath and like all officers that oath means a lot to them. It's just not a few words, black and white words. It means a hell of a lot, it's sort of what keeps us going, it's what keeps people applying for the job. **Leon Eccersall.**<sup>981</sup>

I wouldn't change anything no, I still stick up for what my thoughts were at the time. I spoke to a lot of different people on what I saw and heard, both sides of the story and I wouldn't change my point of view. I would still be for the Tour if it was similar circumstances now, it

---

<sup>979</sup> Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016.

<sup>980</sup> Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016.

<sup>981</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

wouldn't change it at all. I'm glad I did what I did and I'm certainly glad I went over [to South Africa] to see things for myself. **Michael Ward.**<sup>982</sup>

It is evident that participants did not regret their actions or stance on the Tour in hindsight. The participants all agreed that their individual actions were an appropriate response to the Tour.<sup>983</sup> The anti-apartheid demonstrators, who participated in this research, all acknowledged that they had the right to protest against the Tour and were glad that they did so in order to illustrate their opposition to apartheid. Similarly, those who supported the Tour were pleased that they watched or attended the rugby games as it was their legal right to do so.

It is clear that participants were glad that they had not acted violently or been involved in any violent activities.<sup>984</sup> There was a consensus amongst participants that if people were physically involved, either by punching police officers or vandalising property, then they would probably regret those actions today.<sup>985</sup> This study did not include any participants who acted violently during the Tour and therefore conclusions cannot be formed as to whether people who used violence regret those decisions today. From this study, it can be ascertained that violence was not something that many New Zealanders wanted to use and the participants of this study were glad that they had not resorted to it.

Each of the participants was asked if their position on the Tour had changed since 1981 and all responded that it had not.<sup>986</sup> Brian Hays even admitted that if a similar situation were to occur in the

---

<sup>982</sup> Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>983</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016; Beardsley, [interview], Christchurch, 21 October 2016; Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016; Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016; Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016; Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016; Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016; Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016; Taylor, [interview], Christchurch, 17 October 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>984</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016; Burnett-Jones, [interview], Christchurch, 29 October 2016; Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016; Hobbs, [interview], Christchurch, 21 September 2016; Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016; Papprell, [interview], Christchurch, 28 September 2016; Smith, [Interview], Christchurch, 11 October 2016, and Ward, [interview], Christchurch, 30 October 2016.

<sup>985</sup> Anderson, [interview], Christchurch, 10 October 2016.

<sup>986</sup> None of the participants believed that they would change their stance in hindsight as they all believed that what they had done was right.

future he would support a tour because of his love of sport.<sup>987</sup> He believed that he would, “probably still be a pro-tour person and vote National or whoever [was] supporting the tour, but I would still respect my friends.”<sup>988</sup> It appears that people who were involved with the 1981 Tour or had an opinion on the issue have remained steadfast in their views even after 35 years.

---

<sup>987</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>988</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

## Conclusion

**Interviewer:** And finally, is there anything else that you would like to add? Any last stories or memories?

No, I don't think so, I'm just looking at some of your questions here. As I said I do think the protesters, in all their worst, helped stop apartheid and so if that's one thing that came out of it then good on them you know. I think that it would be one of their proudest moments protesting against the '81 Springbok Tour and having an impact on stopping apartheid I think they would be proud of themselves and well, you know, I didn't think I'd ever say it, but probably, you know, good on them. **Rugby supporter Brian Hays.**<sup>989</sup>

I'm just trying to think of anything else, it's one of those things we'll turn off the microphones and the words will start flowing. There was so much camaraderie built between all the staff, I think it also taught the hierarchy, the police hierarchy, how to interact with their front-line staff, how to treat them properly because while they didn't have all the support processes in place to start with they were quick enough to react to it, to see what we needed and we appreciated that. There [were] some amazing managers that developed from it, some people came out with kudos and some people didn't. Yeah very complex, but in all honesty, I don't think I would've changed anything. **Former Police Constable Leon Eccersall.**<sup>990</sup>

Ah this is a difficult one isn't it. It left me with a feeling of frustration and the emotion that how come people can think like that and that has stayed with me that, you know, there was them and us and that people can't see that. It's horrible to let oppression go [on] and just for the sake of a game of rugby so, it's put me off rugby for ever and a day. **Anti-apartheid demonstrator Debbie Osborn.**<sup>991</sup>

---

<sup>989</sup> Hays, [interview], Christchurch, 25 October 2016.

<sup>990</sup> Eccersall, [interview], Christchurch, 7 October 2016.

<sup>991</sup> Osborn, [interview], Christchurch, 26 September 2016.

August 15 1981, is a day that has remained firmly within the memories of those interviewed. For this study's participants, the events which occurred surrounding the first test match at Lancaster Park in Christchurch, have not been easy to forget. Whether they were demonstrating against the Tour, attending the game or policing the protests, participants were able to recall how they felt and what they saw on that day in Christchurch. The participants' memories and perspectives of these events have been invaluable with regard to challenging a number of myths which have been established and perpetuated by the existing historiography on the Tour, and which exist within the New Zealand public's perception of events. It was necessary to interrogate these myths in order to ascertain whether the traditional history of the Tour, as written within the historiography, as well as the current public perception of events surrounding the Tour, are accurate.

The majority of the existing historiography on the Tour places the origin of the debate surrounding New Zealand's sporting contact with South Africa as the 1960 tour. This is due to the fact that there was a substantial increase in public debate and backlash at the exclusion of Māori from the All Blacks team that toured South Africa. Historian Greg Ryan has disputed this 1960 argument, instead placing the genesis for the sporting contact issue as 1937 when there was considerable backlash from Māori leaders and the New Zealand media. The existing historiography has cited 1937 and 1960 as the origin points for the debate surrounding sporting contact because of the amount of public interest in these tours. This is why other tours are not seen to be as significant within the wider issue. Chapter One argued though that the correct origin of the debate was actually the 1919 New Zealand Army tour of South Africa. This is due to the fact that it was during this tour that the first precedent was set for Māori, and those classified as 'coloureds' in South Africa, to be excluded from the New Zealand team at the request of the South African Rugby Board. Furthermore, Chapter One argued that the 1981 Tour did not occur in a vacuum. The Tour was such a contentious issue and resulted in significant public backlash, in the form of violent civil unrest, because of events which occurred surrounding past tours. If precedents regarding the implementation of the colour line in sport had not been set in 1919, when New Zealand and South Africa first met on the rugby field, and had not continued throughout the next

62 years of rugby contact between the two countries, then it is likely that the 1981 Tour would not have been such a significant issue for so many New Zealanders. However, precedents were set during previous tours with regards to the exclusion of Māori from touring South Africa and the exclusion of coloured and black South Africans from being selected for the Springboks. Chapter One therefore provided the context for why the 1981 Tour was such a significant and contentious issue in New Zealand. In doing so, Chapter One also established the setting for the subsequent chapters by providing a detailed history of rugby contact between New Zealand and South Africa prior to 1981.

Previous secondary literature on the Tour has looked at who protested against the Tour and has created categories based solely on the demographics of protesters. As a result, stereotypes have been formed as to who protesters were and why they opposed the Tour. The antithesis of those who protested were assigned the pro-Tour position. Chapter Two argued that rather than demographics, New Zealanders' decision on whether to oppose or support the Tour was influenced by a range of factors, which had little to do with people's age, ethnicity, gender, or geographical location. From the reasons cited by this study's participants the most important reason, which influenced those who opposed the Tour to do so, was South Africa's policy of apartheid. These participants believed apartheid was an abhorrent and morally wrong policy which oppressed black and 'coloured' South Africans. They therefore did not want the Springboks to come to New Zealand. Those participants who supported the Tour did so primarily because they enjoyed watching and playing rugby. Rugby was seen as New Zealand's national sport and religion, it was a sport that New Zealand excelled at and which helped to bring people together. It was for these reasons that those participants, who supported the Tour, wanted the All Blacks to take on the Springboks in New Zealand. This chapter therefore argued that New Zealanders had a range of reasons for opposing or supporting the Tour, which were not influenced by their demographics.

Once the Springboks arrived in New Zealand those who opposed the Tour took action in an attempt to stop the Tour from proceeding. The popular perception exists that all protesters resorted to

violence and vandalism in order to stop games from being played. Chapter Three discussed the protest tactics which were used by anti-apartheid organisations in order to convey to the Government, the NZRFU, and the wider New Zealand public that the Tour should not proceed. This chapter argued that rather, than violence and vandalism other tactics and strategies were implemented in order to educate New Zealanders about apartheid in the hope that this would persuade people to oppose the Tour. This chapter acknowledged though that some protesters did commit acts of violence and vandalism during the Tour. However, the actions of a few individuals should not be representative of the entire anti-apartheid movement as the majority of protesters did not resort to violence and vandalism in order to get their message across.

As the Tour progressed, both police and protest tactics evolved in response to the actions of each other. Protesters began to push back against police lines, whilst police started to use more forceful measures to ensure that the Tour continued. This resulted in accusations being brought against the police, by protesters, that excessive force was used so that rugby games could continue to be played. The popular perception therefore exists amongst anti-apartheid demonstrators from this study, as well as those who have written extensively about the Tour, that excessive force was a common occurrence. Chapter Four argued that excessive force was not as common as it has been perceived. Excessive force did occur in some instances; however, police maintain that it was only used when necessary in order to protect protesters from breaking through police lines and engaging in confrontations with Tour supporters. Furthermore, this chapter argued that confrontations between police and protesters took a serious toll on the mental and emotional health of police personnel because of what they were required to do in order to maintain law and order.

One of the more prominent myths surrounding the Tour, which has been established and perpetuated by the existing historiography, pertains to the apparently divisive nature of the Tour. The literature has argued that the Tour caused fractures to occur in relationships when differences of opinion on the Tour issue arose. However, Chapter Five argued that this was not necessarily the case. Some New



Zealanders did experience a breakdown in their friend and familial relationships as a result of differing opinions on the Tour. Nevertheless, not all relationships were affected in such a negative way. Instead, many New Zealanders were able to maintain their existing relationships through mutual respect, and understanding, of other's opinions on the Tour. Furthermore, many New Zealanders also found support and comradeship within their existing relationships. It can therefore be ascertained that the Tour was not as divisive an issue as it has been portrayed within the existing historiography. Chapter Five also discussed the myth that the Tour was a watershed moment within New Zealand history because it resulted in change within New Zealand society. This myth has been particularly perpetuated by those scholars and individuals who were involved with the anti-apartheid movement in New Zealand. Those who protested against the Tour wanted to believe that their actions made a difference, not just in South Africa, but in New Zealand as well. This chapter argued that the Tour is not the watershed moment as described by some New Zealanders, including many of this study's participants. The Tour can be seen as a watershed moment in the sense that New Zealanders became more aware of issues within New Zealand society with regard to racism and inequality, however this chapter argued that the Tour was not the catalyst for significant change. Rather, changes which occurred in New Zealand society, particularly with regards to the promotion of Māori culture and history, were already happening as a result of the Māori renaissance movement. The Tour was therefore just one part of a larger trend of events. It was this wider movement that eventually resulted in changes to the position of Māori history and culture within mainstream New Zealand society, not the 1981 Tour.

This thesis has argued that several of the myths surrounding the Tour, which have been established by the existing secondary literature and which exist within the public's perception of the Tour, are not necessarily correct. This thesis has challenged these established myths by using an oral history methodology, in order to compare what has been said within the historiography and the public's perception of events with the memories and perspectives of this study's participants. This has enabled a clearer and more in depth understanding of the everyday person's perspective of the events surrounding the 1981 Springbok Tour of New Zealand.

\*\*\*

This thesis has focussed primarily on the city of Christchurch. Participants lived in Christchurch during the Tour and continue to reside here today. This thesis has therefore effectively been a study of the people of Christchurch and their perspectives and experiences of the Tour in this city. Due to the scope and limitations of this thesis it was necessary to only focus on one city, however there is still room to look at other cities and towns in New Zealand. The methodology which has been used for this thesis is mobile and could therefore be implemented for studies on the Tour in other areas of New Zealand. The use of oral history interviews has created an invaluable source of information with regard to the people of Christchurch. Similarly, oral history interviews, using the same questionnaire and interview format, could be conducted in other areas of New Zealand thus gathering the perspectives and stories of different New Zealanders from a diverse range of areas. An overall comparison study could then be conducted in order to compare and contrast the experiences and motivations of different individuals from various areas. This type of study could yield valuable information regarding whether similarities or differences of experiences and perspectives on the Tour exist between different towns and cities in New Zealand.

## Appendix A: Questionnaire

### **The Grassroots of the 1981 Springbok Tour: An examination of the attitudes and actions of everyday New Zealanders during the 1981 Springbok Rugby Tour of New Zealand.**

Please fill in this questionnaire ONLY if you were living in Canterbury during the 1981 Springbok Rugby Tour, if you are currently between the ages of 50 and 65, and you have memories of the Tour and the controversy that surrounded it. You may choose to remain anonymous by not filling in your name and address, but if you do so you will not be eligible for a possible follow-up oral history interview. All information supplied will be held securely and remain confidential, as the accompanying consent form makes clear.

Please note that you are not obliged to answer every question.

#### **A. Personal Details:**

1. Full name:
2. Current address:
3. Email address:
4. Telephone number:
5. Gender:
6. Age:
7. Ethnicity:
8. Religion:
9. Current occupation:
10. Occupation in 1981:
11. Education:
12. City or rural upbringing:

#### **B. Position on the 1981 Springbok Rugby Tour:**

13. Were you for or against the 1981 Springbok Rugby Tour?
  - a. For the Tour (please proceed to Section C)
  - b. Against the Tour (please proceed to Section D)

**C. For the Tour:**

14. Why did you support the Tour? (please circle/highlight those that apply)

- a. You were a rugby fan
- b. You wanted to support your local rugby team
- c. You wanted to support the All Blacks
- d. You believed that rugby and politics should not mix
- e. Other: Please specify:

15. How did you support the Tour? (please circle/highlight those that apply)

- a. Attended games
  - i. If so, what games did you attend?
- b. Participated in pro-Tour marches
- c. Joined pro-Tour organisations
  - i. If, so what organisation(s) did you join?
- d. Other: Please specify:

**D. Against the Tour:**

16. Did you actively protest against the Tour?

17. How did you protest against the Tour? (please circle/highlight those that apply)

- a. Joined an anti-Tour organisation
  - i. If so, please list what anti-Tour organisation(s) you belonged to:
- b. Marched in anti-Tour marches/demonstrations.
- c. Participated in sit-ins

- d. Attended anti-Tour meetings
- e. Wrote letters to New Zealand Rugby Union, Government, etc.
- f. Other: Please specify:

18. Why did you protest against the Tour? (please circle/highlight all those that apply)

- a. Against the Apartheid regime in South Africa
- b. Against the racial selection of rugby players
- c. Believed that sporting contact with South Africa endorsed the Apartheid regime
- d. Against the exclusion of Māori from mainstream New Zealand society
- e. Against the exclusion of women from mainstream New Zealand society
- f. Against the exclusion of women from rugby
- g. Other: Please specify:

19. I am happy to be contacted by Melissa Morrison with a view to arranging a recorded oral history interview: Yes ☐ No ☐

#### **E. Personal Reflections:**

This is an opportunity for you to write an account of your experiences of the 1981 Springbok Rugby Tour of New Zealand. Areas you might want to address include: Your personal views on the Tour – the Christchurch test match – what you remember about the Tour? – the use of force by police – your motivations for your actions – what did you see? – your thoughts on the situation in 1981 – thoughts on rugby and politics, should they mix? – how were you affected at the time? – your family/social/working life, were they impacted by the Tour? – what changed in the aftermath of the Tour - New Zealand's race relations? – thoughts on the Apartheid regime in South Africa – thoughts on the New Zealand Rugby Football Union – thoughts on the New Zealand Government in 1981.

Thank you for answering this questionnaire. The information you provide will be incredibly valuable for my research on the experiences of everyday New Zealanders during the 1981 Springbok Rugby Tour of New Zealand.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

## **Appendix B: Topics/Questions used in Oral History Interviews**

### **1. Biographical Details**

- Name
- Place and date of birth
- Age
- Ethnicity
- Occupation
- Family
- Religion
- Political views

### **2. Your upbringing**

- Where were you brought up? Urban (town, city) or rural (farm)?
  - Do you think that where you grew up affected your view on the Tour?
- Schooling/education
- Parents' occupations
- Parents' political views
  - Did their views have an impact on your own?

### **3. In 1981 before the Tour**

- Age
- Occupation
- Living situation
- Religion
- Political views
- View of New Zealand society
- View on race relations in New Zealand
- Position of rugby in New Zealand society
- Thoughts on Apartheid in South Africa

### **4. The Tour:**

- Were you for or against the Tour?
- Memories of the Tour
  - When someone says Springbok Tour 1981 what comes to mind?
  - Is there a specific moment of the Tour that stands out for you?
  - Media coverage of the Tour
- How did the Tour impact your everyday life?
- How did it effect your social/working/family life?

### **5. Those who supported the Tour:**

- Why did you support the Tour?
  - Were you a rugby fan?
  - Were you involved in rugby yourself?
  - Did you want to support your local rugby team?

- Did you want to support the All Blacks?
- Did you believe that rugby and politics shouldn't mix?
- Were there any other reasons that you supported the Tour?
- How did you support the Tour?
  - Did you attend any games?
    - Your memories of the games
    - Was your experience before, during, and after the game affected by protesters/police presence?
  - Did you watch any other games on TV?
  - Did you participate in pro-Tour marches or join a pro-Tour organisation?
  - Did you do anything else to show your support for the Tour?
    - Write letters, etc.
- You stated that you were against apartheid, but for the Tour? Could these two things go together?
- Do you believe in freedom of speech? That everyone has the right to protest?
- In your opinion did the Tour become about law and order, rather than apartheid?
- Were you concerned about what the Tour would do to New Zealand's reputation?
- Did your rugby club experience any vandalism during the Tour?
- Your opinion on the Rugby Union
- Your opinion on the National Government and Prime Minister Robert Muldoon
- Thoughts on the protesters?
  - Your opinion of the protesters
  - Your thoughts on the tactics/methods of the protesters to get their point across
  - Do you think the majority of protesters were genuine in their beliefs?
  - Did you get into a verbal/physical confrontation with protesters?
  - Were you prepared to listen to other people's points of views?
  - Do you think that the protesters would have been more successful in getting their message across if they hadn't resorted to violence and vandalism?
  - Do you think the protesters were inconsistent in their protesting about the lack of human rights in only one particular country when human rights violations took place in other countries, such as Russia?
- Thoughts on the police:
  - What do you believe the main role of the police was during the Tour?
  - Do you think police did a good job in policing the Tour/protecting the Springboks/protecting rugby supporters' right to watch the game?
  - Did you witness any confrontations between police and protesters? Were the actions of both justified?
  - Do you think that the police were provoked by protesters?
  - Do you believe that the use of force was justified against protesters?

## 6. Those who opposed the Tour:

- Why did you oppose the Tour?
  - Were you protesting against the Apartheid regime in South Africa?
  - Did you believe that sporting contact with South Africa endorsed the apartheid regime?
  - Were you protesting against the racial selection of rugby players?
  - Were you protesting because you yourself felt marginalised within New Zealand society?
- How did you oppose the Tour?
  - Joined anti-Tour organisations
    - If so, what anti-Tour organisations did you join?
  - Protested
    - Did you ever wear protection? Helmets, padding, etc.
  - Did you oppose the Tour in any other way?
    - Made placards, banners, sent letters, leaflet drops, etc.
- Protester tactics?
  - Was there a change from non-violent to violent protest tactics?
  - Was there a marked difference in atmosphere at earlier protests compared to later ones?
  - Do you think some of the tactics used by some protesters were extreme? i.e. bomb at Christchurch airport, broken glass and fishhooks on ground at Lancaster Park?
- Thoughts on the police:
  - Use of force
  - Police tactics
  - Do you think that some protesters legitimately provoked the police?
  - Did you see police brutality taking place? Or did you get this information second-hand?
  - Did you lose respect for the police because of their conduct during the Tour?
  - Did the events at Molesworth Street in Wellington effect you and how you protested?
  - Were you scared of being hurt, killed, arrested?
- Your beliefs:
  - Did you know what the Gleneagles Agreement was?
    - Do you believe that Muldoon failed to meet his obligations under the Agreement?
  - What was your opinion of:
    - The Rugby Union
    - The Police
    - The National Government
    - Prime Minister Robert Muldoon
  - Do you believe that protesters helped to save New Zealand's overseas reputation – if people hadn't protested would the damage to New Zealand's reputation have been worse than it was?



- Lifestyle:
  - Did you have to make any changes to your lifestyle? Because of how much time/energy you put into the protest movement?
  - Did the emotional/physical/mental exhaustion affect other aspects of your life – social/family/work?
  - Did you ever feel isolated from your friends/family/workmates because of your position?
  - If you had children, did you take them to protests?
    - Why/why not?
- Thoughts on those who supported the Tour?
  - Your opinion of those who supported the Tour
  - Were you prepared to listen to other people's points of views?
  - Did you believe that people could be against apartheid, but for the Tour? Could these two things go together?
  - Were you yourself or anyone you knew specifically targeted or injured by Tour supporters?
  - Some Tour supporters, at the time and in the aftermath of the Tour, have questioned the consistency of protesters in regards to only protesting against South Africa and the apartheid regime, whilst ignoring countries with equally appalling human rights issues, such as Russia. What do you say about this?

## 8. The Tour Aftermath:

- The immediate aftermath of the Tour
  - Your memories of what happened after the Springboks left New Zealand
- Changes in your own thinking about rugby, race relations
  - Do you still believe that rugby and politics do not mix? (ask if applicable to participant)
  - Did the issues surrounding the Tour highlight problems within New Zealand's own race relations?
- Your thoughts on the re-election of Muldoon in 1981
- Changes in New Zealand society
  - Did you notice any changes within wider New Zealand society as a result of the Tour?
  - Did people become more aware of racial issues within New Zealand?
    - What was done to bring closure to some of these issues?
  - Did people become more aware of the issues that Māori and women had within mainstream New Zealand society?
    - Did people begin to see a connection between the oppression caused by apartheid in South Africa and the less obvious exclusion of Māori from mainstream society?
- How was rugby affected after the Tour?
  - Was there a decline in participation in rugby following the Tour?

- Your thoughts on the High Court Injunction that prevented the All Blacks from touring South Africa in 1985 on the grounds that it would be against rugby's best interests?
- Your thoughts on the rebel Tour to South Africa in 1986
- When apartheid was abolished, how did you feel?
  - If you protested against the Tour, did you feel like you played a role in bringing about change in South Africa?

### **9. In Hindsight:**

- How do you feel about your actions now?
- With the benefit of hindsight, were your actions an appropriate response to the issue?
  - Do you think another course of action should have been taken?
- If something similar were to happen within today's society where would you stand on the issue? The same place as where you stood in 1981? Why has/hasn't your position changed?
- What would you do differently?
- Any final reflections on the Tour and its impact
  - Any last remarks, memories, stories that you would like to share.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

#### **Oral History Interviews**

Anderson, William. [Interview with Melissa Morrison]. Christchurch. 10 October 2016.

Beardsley, Christine. [Interview with Melissa Morrison]. Christchurch. 21 October 2016.

Burnett-Jones, Brent. [Interview with Melissa Morrison]. Christchurch. 29 October 2016.

Eccersall, Leon. [Interview with Melissa Morrison]. Christchurch. 7 October 2016.

Hays, Brian. [Interview with Melissa Morrison]. Christchurch. 25 October 2016.

Hobbs, Tim. [Interview with Melissa Morrison]. Christchurch. 21 September 2016.

Osborn, Debbie. [Interview with Melissa Morrison]. Christchurch. 26 September 2016.

Papprill, Jocelyn. [Interview with Melissa Morrison]. Christchurch. 28 September 2016.

Smith, Chris. [Interview with Melissa Morrison]. Christchurch. 11 October 2016.

Taylor, Kevin. [Interview with Melissa Morrison]. Christchurch. 17 October 2016.

Ward, Michael. [Interview with Melissa Morrison]. Christchurch. 30 October 2016.

#### **Questionnaires**

---. [Questionnaire]. Palmerston South. 30 August 2016.

---. [Questionnaire]. Christchurch. 30 August 2016.

Anderson, William. [Questionnaire]. Christchurch. 29 August 2016.

Beardsley, Christine. [Questionnaire]. Christchurch. 30 August 2016.

Burnett-Jones, Brent. [Questionnaire]. Christchurch. 22 August 2016.

Nalder, Barry. [Questionnaire]. Whangarei. 1 September 2016.

Osborn, Debbie. [Questionnaire]. Christchurch. 3 August 2016.

Papprill, Jocelyn. [Questionnaire]. Christchurch. 18 July 2016.

Parker, Nick. [Questionnaire]. Christchurch. 8 September 2016.

Smith, Chris. [Questionnaire]. Christchurch. 15 August 2016.

### **Written Personal Testimony**

Springbok Rugby Tour Papers. 'Springbok Tour Archive no.6-113496.' University of Canterbury,

1981. Accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

Springbok Rugby Tour Papers. 'Springbok Tour Archive no.17-113467.' University of Canterbury,

1981. Accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

Springbok Rugby Tour Papers. 'Springbok Tour Archive no.18-113508.' University of Canterbury,

1981. Accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

Springbok Rugby Tour Papers. 'Springbok Tour Archive no.24-113474.' University of Canterbury,

1981. Accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

Springbok Rugby Tour Papers. 'Springbok Tour Archive no.32(I)-113483.' University of Canterbury,

1981. Accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

Springbok Rugby Tour Papers. 'Springbok Tour Archive no.65-113554.' University of Canterbury,

1981. Accessed 15 April 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

Springbok Rugby Tour Papers. 'Springbok Tour Archive no.69-113557.' University of Canterbury,

1981. Accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

Springbok Rugby Tour Papers. 'Springbok Tour Archive no.70-113558.' University of Canterbury,

1981. Accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

Springbok Rugby Tour Papers. 'Springbok Tour Archive no.71-113559.' University of Canterbury,

1981. Accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

Springbok Rugby Tour Papers. 'Springbok Tour Archive no.72-113560.' University of Canterbury,

1981. Accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

Springbok Rugby Tour Papers. 'Springbok Tour Archive no.75-113565.' University of Canterbury,

1981. Accessed 14 March 2017. Available from: [http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives\\_pages/162.html](http://digital-library.canterbury.ac.nz/data/library3/archives_pages/162.html).

Wellington Springbok Tour Archive. COST Surveys. J.C. Beaglehole Room. Victoria University, Wellington.

## Newspapers

'Arawas' Protest Support.' *Press*. 25 July 1936, 8. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 10 February 2017.

'Batons and Blood: Police charge city marchers.' *The Evening Post*. 30 July 1981, 1. In *Sporting Contacts with South Africa*. Christchurch: Canterbury Public Library, 1990.

Buck, Peter. 'Springboks and Māoris.' *New Zealand Herald*. 14 September 1921, 8. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 15 February 2017.

*Daily Telegraph* (Hawkes Bay). 10 September 1921, 5. In Ron Palenski. *Rugby: A New Zealand history*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015.

*Dominion*. 2 September 1965. In Malcolm Templeton. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.

Doudney, Tom. 'Christchurch student starts new research on Springboks Tour.' *New Zealand Herald*. 28 July 2016. Accessed 30 July 2017.

[http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c\\_id=1&objectid=11683123](http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11683123).

*Evening Post*. 1 April 1986. In Malcolm Templeton. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.

*Evening Post*. 2 September 1948. In Ron Palenski. *Rugby: A New Zealand history*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015.

*Evening Post*. 3 March 1986. In Malcolm Templeton. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.

*Evening Post*. 12 June 1959. In Malcolm Templeton. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.

*Evening Post*. 30 July 1981. In Rachel Barrowman. 'A Report on the Molesworth Street Incident.' *The Police and the 1981 Tour*. Edited by Malcolm McKinnon, Peter McPhee, and Jock Phillips. Wellington: Victoria University History Department, 1985.

'Football.' *Timaru Herald*. 28 July 1879, 2. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 28 February 2017.

'Hewson puts the boot in 1981 tour.' *The Dominion Post*. Last updated 23 July 2011.

<http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/5329433/Hewson-puts-the-boot-in-1981-tour>.

*Johannesburg Star*. 14 August 1965. In Malcolm Templeton. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.

'Māori and Springboks.' *Auckland Star*. 14 September 1921, 7. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 16 February 2017.

'Māoris and Africa.' *Auckland Star*. 11 October 1927, 9. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 10 February 2017.

'Māoris and Springboks.' *New Zealand Herald*. 15 September 1921, 4. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 20 February 2017.

'Māoris and the Springboks.' *Press*. 27 July 1936, 8. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 10 February 2017.

'Māori Protest.' *Press*. 24 July 1936, 10. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 24 January 2017.

'News of the Day.' *The Colonist* (Nelson). 17 May 1870, 6. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 28 February 2017.

*New Zealand Herald*. 3 September 1948. In Malcolm Templeton. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.

*New Zealand Herald*. 6 December 1980. In Malcolm Templeton. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.

*New Zealand Herald*. 12 April 1949. In Ron Palenski. *Rugby: A New Zealand history*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015.

New Zealand Press Association. 8 June 1959. In Richard Thompson. *Race and Sport*. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

New Zealand Press Association. 12 June 1959. In Richard Thompson. *Race and Sport*. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

'New Zealand Rugby Tour.' *New Zealand Herald*. 31 July 1919, 7. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 20 February 2017.

*New Zealand Times*. 21 October 1879, 2. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 28 February 2017.

*Poverty Bay Herald*. 5 November 1919, 2. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 20 February 2017.

*Press*. 6 August 1948. In Richard Thompson. *Retreat from Apartheid: New Zealand's sporting contacts with South Africa*. Wellington: Oxford University Press, 1975.

*Press*. 9 August 1948. In Richard Thompson. *Retreat from Apartheid: New Zealand's sporting contacts with South Africa*. Wellington: Oxford University Press, 1975.

*Press*. 31 March 1986. In Malcolm Templeton. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.



Price, Anna. 'That Tour: Kiwis then and now.' *Christchurch Mail*. 28 July 2016. Accessed 30 July 2017.

<https://www.pressreader.com/new-zealand/christchurch-mail/20160728/281522225451090>.

'Rugby Football.' *Auckland Star*. 31 May 1927, 10. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 12 February 2017.

*Southern Cross*. 2 October 1948. In Richard Thompson. *Retreat from Apartheid: New Zealand's sporting contacts with South Africa*. Wellington: Oxford University Press, 1975.

'Springboks and Māoris.' *Press*. 7 August 1936, 15. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 10 February 2017.

'The Colour Line.' *Otago Daily Times*. 17 September 1919, 10. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 15 February 2017.

'Third Test Match.' *New Zealand Herald*. 13 September 1921, 6. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 15 February 2017.

'Would Play if Asked.' *Press*. 25 July 1936, 19. Available from: PapersPast. Accessed 12 July 2017.

## Correspondence

---. [Personal Correspondence]. Christchurch. 30 August 2016.

Craven, Danie. 'Letter of 23 October 1958, from Hogg to Craven, reply of 10 November 1958.' In Malcolm Templeton. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.

Kirk, Norman. 'Letter to Jack Sullivan, 6 April 1973.' In Malcolm Templeton. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.

'Letter of 18 September 1981, from Secretary of Foreign Affairs to Richard Long at the *Dominion*.' In Malcolm Templeton. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.

'Telegram 620 of 17 September 1980, from Wellington to New Zealand Embassy Peking.' In Malcolm Templeton. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.

'Telegram 6175 of 20 June 1981, from NZHC London to Wellington.' In Malcolm Templeton. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.

### Speeches

Verwoerd, Hendrik. 'Loskop Dam Speech.' In Douglas Booth. *The Race Game: Sport and politics in South Africa*. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1998.

### Official Documents

Blazey, Ces. 'Statement: Tour – South Africa to NZ 1981.' 9 April 1981. In Ron Palenski. *Rugby: A New Zealand history*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015.

'Commonwealth Statement on Apartheid in Sport.' London, 15 June 1977. Accessed 1 March 2017.  
[http://www.nzlii.org/nz/legis/hist\\_bill/gab1981791187.pdf](http://www.nzlii.org/nz/legis/hist_bill/gab1981791187.pdf).

Marshall, Jack. 'Statement on Relations with South Africa.' 7 March 1972. In Malcolm Templeton. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.

*New Zealand Parliamentary Debates*. Volume 344, 7 September 1965, 2527. Available from:  
 Hansard. Accessed 23 June 2017.

NZRFU. 'Management Committee Minutes.' 19 October 1927. In Greg Ryan. 'Anthropological Football: Māori and the 1937 Springbok Tour of New Zealand.' *Tackling Rugby Myths: Rugby and New Zealand society 1854-2004*. Edited by Greg Ryan. Dunedin: University of Otago Press, 2005. 105-122.

'Press statement from Prime Minister's Office, 19 July 1974.' In Malcolm Templeton. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.

'Prime Minister's Statement, 6 July 1981, 1.' In Ron Palenski. *Rugby: A New Zealand history*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015.

'The South African Government's Official 'Multi-national' Sports Policy.' In Robert Archer and Antoine Bouillon. *The South African Game: Sport and racism*. London: Zed Press, 1982.

## Television

*Close Up*. '1981 Tour Special.' TVNZ. 4 July 2006. [Television Program].

## Published Resources

Ministry of Education. 'The New Zealand School Curriculum.' Last updated 25 February 2016.  
<http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/The-New-Zealand-Curriculum#collapsible14>.

*The Treaty of Waitangi: Questions and answers, a resource kit for Pakeha*. Wellington: Project Waitangi, 1989.

## Secondary sources

### Books

*Apartheid: The facts*. London: International Defence and Aid Fund, 1983.

Archer, Robert and Bouillon, Antoine. *The South African Game: Sport and racism*. London: Zed Press, 1982.

Ballara, Angela. *Proud to be White? A survey of Pakeha prejudice in New Zealand*. Auckland: Heinemann, 1986.

Barrowman, Rachel. 'A Report on the Molesworth Street Incident.' *The Police and the 1981 Tour*. Edited by Malcolm McKinnon, Peter McPhee, and Jock Phillips. Wellington: Victoria University History Department, 1985. 23-49.

Booth, Douglas. *The Race Game: Sport and politics in South Africa*. London: Frank Cass, 1998.

Brooking, Tom. *The History of New Zealand*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2004.

Cameron, Don. *Barbed Wire Boks*. Auckland: Rugby Press, 1981.

Carlyon, Jenny and Morrow, Diana. *Changing Times: New Zealand since 1945*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2013.

Chapple, Geoff. *1981: The Tour*. Wellington: Reed, 1984.

Chester, R.H. and McMillan, N.A.C. *The Visitors: The history of international rugby teams in New Zealand*. Auckland: Moa Publications, 1990.

Dann, Christine. *Up from Under: Women and Liberation in New Zealand 1970-1985*. Wellington: Allen and Unwin, 1985.

Davenport, Rodney and Saunders, Christopher. *South Africa: A modern history*. Fifth edition. London: Macmillan Press, 2000.

Fleras, Augie and Spoonley, Paul. *Recalling Aotearoa: Indigenous politics and ethnic relations in New Zealand*. Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Fougere, Geoff. 'Sport, Culture and Identity: The case of rugby football.' *Culture and Identity in New Zealand*. Edited by David Novitz and Bill Willmott. Wellington: GP Books, 1989. 110-122.

Greig, Louise. 'The Police and the Tour.' *The Police and the 1981 Tour*. Edited by Malcolm McKinnon, Peter McPhee, and Jock Phillips. Wellington: Victoria University History Department, 1985. 4-22.

Grundlingh, Albert. 'Playing for Power? Rugby, Afrikaner nationalism and masculinity in South Africa, c.1900-c.1970.' *Making Men: Rugby and masculine identity*. Edited by John Nauright and Timothy J.L. Chandler. London: Frank Cass, 1996. 181-204.

Hughes, Charlotte. 'Moir's Lament? Feminist advocacy and the 1981 Springbok Tour of New Zealand.' *Tackling Rugby Myths: Rugby and New Zealand society, 1854-2004*. Edited by Greg Ryan. Dunedin: University of Otago Press, 2005. 137-150.

King, Michael. 'Between Two Worlds.' *The Oxford History of New Zealand*. Second edition. Edited by Geoffrey W. Rice. Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1992. 285-307.

King, Michael. *The Penguin History of New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin, 2003.

King, Peter and Phillips, Jock. 'A Social Analysis of the Springbok Tour Protesters.' *Counting the Cost: The 1981 Springbok Tour in Wellington*. Edited by David Mackay, Malcolm McKinnon, Peter McPhee, and Jock Phillips. Wellington: Victoria University History Department Occasional Paper, 1982. 3-14.

Lapping, Brian. *Apartheid: A history*. London: Grafton Books, 1986.

Lummis, Trevor. 'Structure and Validity in Oral Evidence.' *The Oral History Reader*. Second edition. Edited by Robert Perks and Alistair Thompson. New York: Routledge, 2006. 255-260.

Luxford, Bob. *Alex the Bruce*. Palmerston North: Rugby Museum Society, 1994.

MacDonald, Finlay. *The Game of Our Lives: The story of rugby and New Zealand – and how they've shaped each other*. Auckland: Viking, 1996.

MacLean, Malcolm. 'Of Warriors and Blokes: The problem of Māori rugby for Pakeha masculinity in New Zealand.' *Making the Rugby World: Race, gender, commerce*. Edited by Timothy J.L. Chandler and John Nauright. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1999. 1-26.

McIlraith, Matt. *Robbie Deans: Red, black and gold*. Auckland: Mower, 2014.

Mein Smith, Philippa. *A Concise History of New Zealand*. Second edition. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Meurant, Ross. *The Red Squad Story*. Auckland: Harlen Publishing, 1982.

Moon, Paul. *Turning Points: Events that changed the course of New Zealand history*. Auckland: New Holland, 2013.

Morris, Juliet. *With All Our Strength: An account of the anti-Tour movement in Christchurch 1981*. Christchurch: Black Cat, 1982.

Nauright, John and Black, David. 'Hitting Them Where It Hurts: Springbok-All Black rugby, masculine national identity and counter-hegemonic struggle.' *Making Men: Rugby and masculine identity*. Edited by John Nauright and Timothy J.L. Chandler. London: Frank Cass, 1996. 205-226.

Nauright, John and Black, David. 'New Zealand and International Sport: The case of All Black-Springbok rugby, sanctions and protest against apartheid 1959-1992.' *Sport, Power and Society in New Zealand: Historical and contemporary perspectives*. Edited by John Nauright. Sydney: Australian Society for Sports History, 1995. 67-93.

Nauright, John. *Sport, Cultures and Identities in South Africa*. London: Leicester University Press, 1997.

Newnham, Tom. *By Batons and Barbed Wire: A response to the 1981 Springbok Tour of New Zealand*. Auckland: Real Pictures, 1981.

Palenski, Ron. *Rugby: A New Zealand history*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015.

Portelli, Alessandro. *The Battle of Valle Giulia: Oral history and the art of dialogue*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997.

Portelli, Alessandro. 'What Makes Oral History Different.' *The Oral History Reader*. Second edition. Edited by Robert Perks and Alistair Thompson. New York: Routledge, 2006. 32-42.

Richards, Trevor. *Dancing on Our Bones: New Zealand, South Africa, rugby and racism*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 1999.

Ritchie, Donald A. 'Introduction: The evolution of oral history.' *The Oxford Handbook of Oral History*. Edited by Donald A. Ritchie. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. 3-19.

Ryan, Greg. 'Anthropological Football: Māori and the 1937 Springbok Tour of New Zealand.' *Tackling Rugby Myths: Rugby and New Zealand society 1854-2004*. Edited by Greg Ryan. Dunedin: University of Otago Press, 2005. 105-122.

Shears, Richard and Gidley, Isobelle. *Storm out of Africa! The 1981 Springbok Tour of New Zealand*. Auckland: Macmillan, 1981.

Smith, Paul and Callan, Louise. *Our People, Our Century: 1900-2000*. Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett, 1999.

Sorrenson, M. P. K. 'Uneasy Bedfellows: A survey of New Zealand's relations with South Africa.' *New Zealand, South Africa and Sport: Background papers*. Wellington: New Zealand Institute of International Affairs, 1976. 28-64.

Swan, Arthur C. *History of New Zealand Rugby Football 1870-1945*. Wellington: A.H. & A.W. Reed, 1948.

Templeton, Malcolm. *Human Rights and Sporting Contacts: New Zealand attitudes to race relations in South Africa 1921-94*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1998.

Thompson, Paul. 'The Voice of the Past: Oral history.' *The Oral History Reader*. Second edition.

Edited by Robert Perks and Alistair Thompson. New York: Routledge, 2006. 25-31.

Thompson, Richard. *Race and Sport*. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Thompson, Richard. *Retreat from Apartheid: New Zealand's sporting contacts with South Africa*.

Wellington: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Thomson, Alistair. 'Memory and Remembering Oral History.' *The Oxford Handbook of Oral History*.

Edited by Donald A. Ritchie. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. 77-95.

Zavos, Spiro. *Winters of Revenge: The bitter rivalry between the All Blacks and the Springboks*.

Auckland: Viking, 1997.

### Unpublished Theses

Arthur, Lucy. 'Rugby, Racism and Fear: The reaction of Invercargill people to the 1981 Springbok

Tour of New Zealand.' University of Otago: Honours Dissertation, 1998.

Potgieter, Sebastian. *Barbed Wire Boks: The long shadow of the 1981 Springbok Tour of New Zealand*

*and the United States of America*. Stellenbosch University: MA Thesis, 2017.

### Articles

Awatere, Donna. 'Rugby, Racism and Riot Gear: New Zealand in the winter of 1981.' *Broadsheet*.

Number 94, November 1981. 10-15.

Dann, Christine. 'The Game is Over.' *Broadsheet*. Number 97, March 1982. 26-28.

MacLean, Malcolm. 'Anti-apartheid Boycotts and the Affective Economies of Struggle: The case of

Aotearoa New Zealand.' *Sports in Society: Cultures, commerce, media, politics*. Volume 13,

number 1, December 2009. 72-91. Available from: Taylor and Francis Online. Accessed 3

March 2017.



MacLean, Malcolm. 'Football as Social Critique: Protest movements, rugby and history in Aotearoa, New Zealand.' *The International Journal of the History of Sport*. Volume 17, number 2-3, 2000. 255-277. Available from: Taylor and Francis Online. Accessed 15 June 2016.

*New Zealand Foreign Affairs Review*. Volume 27, number 3, July-September 1977.

Pennington, Donald C. 'Being Wise After the Event: An investigation in hindsight bias.' *Current Psychological Research*. Volume 1, 1981. 271-282.

Phillips, Jock. 'A Nation of Two Halves.' *New Zealand Listener*. July 2006. 12-19.

Pollock, Jacob. 'We don't want your Racist Tour: The 1981 Springbok Tour and the anxiety of settlement in Aotearoa/New Zealand.' *Graduate Journal of Asia-Pacific Studies*. Volume 2, number 1, 2004. 32-43.

Thompson, Shona. 'Thank the Ladies for the Plates: The incorporation of women into sport.' *Leisure Studies*. Volume 9, number 2, 1990. 135-143.

Thomson, Alistair. 'Four Paradigm Transformations of Oral History.' *The Oral History Review*. Volume 34, number 1, 2006. 49-70.

## Websites

'All Blacks versus Springboks.' Accessed 15 February 2017.

<https://nzhistory.govt.nz/culture/1981-springbok-tour/all-blacks-vs-springboks>.

Lyon, Kristin., Legg, Stephen, and Toulson, Paul. 'Diversity Management: A generational cohort perspective.' Accessed 21 April 2017.

[https://www.hrinz.org.nz/Site/Resources/Knowledge\\_Base/A-H/Diversity.aspx](https://www.hrinz.org.nz/Site/Resources/Knowledge_Base/A-H/Diversity.aspx).

Mulholland, Malcolm. 'Parekura Tureia.' Last updated 27 January 2015.

<http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/photograph/39619/parekura-tureia>.

‘Originals kick off All Black tradition.’ Last updated 19 January 2017.

<https://nzhistory.govt.nz/originals-kick-off-all-black-tradition>.

‘The Long Road to the Cup.’ Accessed 14 June 2017.

<https://nzhistory.govt.nz/culture/1987-rugby-world-cup/the-world-cup-is-born>.

‘1982 Football World Cup – introduction.’ Last updated 15 August 2014.

<https://nzhistory.govt.nz/culture/1982-soccer-world-cup>.